

A CENTURY OF DRINK REFORM
IN THE
UNITED STATES

AUGUST F. FEHLANDT

JESUIT-KRAUSS-MCCORMICK LIBRARY



3 9967 00017 4560

HV5292

ACCESSION NUMBER

SHELF NUMBER

F2

38226

~~C-108820~~

The Virginia Library
McCormick
Theological Seminary
of the
Presbyterian Church, Chicago.

From the *Garrett Bib. Institute. Fund.*

RECEIVED

Jan. 1914.

Exhibition



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

A Century of Drink Reform

A
Century of Drink Reform
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BY
AUGUST F. FEHLANDT



- 14643 -
CINCINNATI: JENNINGS AND GRAHAM
NEW YORK: EATON AND MAINS

COPYRIGHT, 1904, BY
AUGUST F. FEHLANDT

5292

F 296

“O Willie brewed a peck o’ maut,
And Rob and Allan cam to pree;
Three blither hearts that lee lang nicht
Ye wadna found in Christendie.

We are na’ fou, we’re no that fou,
But just a drappie in our e’e;
The cock may crawl, the day may daw,
But ay we’ll taste the barley bree.”

—BURNS.

“The moon still fills her silver horn,
But, ah! her beams nae mair they see;
Nor crawling cock, nor dawning morn,
Disturbs the worm’s dark revelry.

For they were na’ fou, na’ nae that fou,
But clay-cauld death has clased ilk e’e;
And waefu’! now the gowden moon
Beams on the graves of a’ the three.”

—ANON.

38226

FOREWORD.



THE finest and most difficult of human achievements, whether for man individually as a personal unit, or collectively as a political unit, is the art of self-government. Ignorance — Indifference — Self-interest, this is the Cerberus that ever lies at the gateway of humanity's under-world, that the imprisoned Man may not escape.

Among a people where a monarch holds absolute sway, the problem of government is simple. His word is law, and the people obey him. But where the people themselves are allowed to speak and choose, complications at once enter into the problem. Opinions and desires will come into conflict, and the self-interests of men will trespass upon the welfare of the whole. Besides, social laws and forces are many and complex, and the ways of evil devious. Democracy can yield her best fruits only where intelligence and sound morals generally prevail.

Where there is but one voice in the soul of man—the voice of God—the problem of self-government or self-control, too, is simple. Man obeys that voice, and his rich heritage is peace and soul growth. But with many conflicting unchained desires, like so many voices calling to him, and with personal freedom of choice, man does not always listen to wisdom or goodness, and he fails of his best success, and may fail utterly.

In no one thing is this illustrated more forcibly than in man's struggle with his appetite for strong drink. For generations and centuries he has been brought under its seductive influence. Every age and every condition of society, from half-savagery to highest civilization, bears witness to the enslaving and destructive power of this drug. So manifest has become man's weakness, so multiplied the sorrow and shame and outrage growing out of it, that after the occasional voice of admonition by some prophet of God, the conscience and humane sentiment of Christendom has in this latter time applied itself in mighty earnestness to the situation.

Of this struggle, than which there is no more

stirring page in all the annals of human liberty, it is the purpose of this book to give a brief outline. Of the main epochs in this struggle, its men and its measures, no man should be ignorant. Compelled of necessity to some limitation of our theme, the narrative will confine itself to this land where the reform first took definite shape, a land where the experiment of self-government was to be tested first on a large scale, and whose people are determined, we believe, that as touching those things which vitally affect the interests of civilization, this experiment shall not prove a failure.

And yet, after a full hundred years, the end is not. If these pages shall contribute aught to hasten it, it will not be because of any effort to arouse the indifferent or to preach to the wicked, but rather, if it please God, by pointing out directions to those who are already inquiring the way out.

THE AUTHOR.

1904, INDEPENDENCE DAY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.



A. AGITATION.

I.

CHAPTER I. THE AWAKENING.—MODERATION. 1785-1826.

	PAGE
The Drinking Customs of Society.—Receive First Effective Blow from Dr. Benjamin Rush.—His Work.—The First “Temperance” Societies.—Voices from the Pulpit.—Dr. Rush at the Presbyterian General Assembly, 1811.—The Churches Take Up the Question.—Lyman Beecher’s Six Sermons,	19

II.

CHAPTER II. PROGRESSION.—ABSTINENCE. 1826-1851.

First Period, 1826-1836—Abstinence from Spirits.

The American Temperance Society, Boston, 1826.—Dr. Justin Edwards.—Effective Laborers and Literature at Opening of this Period, 1826-1831.—Temperance Reform Introduced Abroad.—Golden

	PAGE
Age of Temperance Literature, 1831-1836.—Progress and Growth.—First National Temperance Convention, Philadelphia, 1833, - - -	52

Second Period, 1836-1851—Teetotalism.

Second National Temperance Convention, Saratoga, 1836.—The Washingtonian Movement, 1840.—Hawkins.—Not Prevention Merely, but Reclamation now the Program of the Reform.—Abraham Lincoln.—Fraternal Temperance Orders: Rechabites, 1841; Sons of Temperance, 1842; Cadets of Temperance; Templars of Honor and Temperance, 1845; Good Templars, 1851; First World's Temperance Convention, London, 1846.—Gough.—Father Mathew in America, - - -	76
--	----

III.

CHAPTER III. CULMINATION.—PROHIBITION. 1851-1856.

The Man Undoing the Work of the Reform Discovered.—Neal Dow's Interview with the Rumseller.—The Father of Prohibition.—Successive Steps Toward Complete Prohibition.—First United States Supreme Court Decision on Temperance Question, 1847.—Prohibition Enacted: 1851, Maine; 1852, Minnesota, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Vermont; 1853, Michigan; 1854, Connecticut; 1855, New York, New Hampshire, Nebraska Territory, Delaware, Indiana.—Progress in Other States.—Reform Suddenly Arrested.—Slavery.—Secession, - - - - - - -	104
---	-----

B. COMPLICATION.

INTERNAL REVENUE ACT, JULY 1, 1862.
TAXATION.

I.

CHAPTER IV. ITS MEANING FOR THE GOVERNMENT.

	PAGE
1. Permission.—2. Protection.—3. Partnership.—	
4. Promotion.—National Revenue from Liquor	
Trade.—Capital Invested, Output, and Per Capita	
Consumption in the United States, - - -	139

II.

CHAPTER V. ITS MEANING FOR THE LIQUOR TRADE.

I. Organization for Greater Efficiency ; Larger Cap-	
ital ; Wealth.—II. Organization to Wield Political	
Power.—The United States Brewers' Association,	
November 12, 1862.—The National Protective Asso-	
ciation, 1886.—Resources and Methods of the	
Liquor Power, - - - - -	172

III.

CHAPTER VI. ITS MEANING FOR THE FREE CITIZEN.

A Bribe to Conscience.—Money and Morals Incom-	
mensurable.—Where all the Money Comes From.	
—The Sound Theory of Exchange.—Approximate	
Money Loss to Society Annually through the	
Drink Trade, - - - - -	193

C. EDUCATION.

I.

CHAPTER VII. MORAL MOVEMENTS SINCE
THE WAR.

PAGE

- (1) National Temperance Society and Publication-house, 1865.—(2) Royal Templars of Temperance, 1869.—(3) Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America, 1872.—(4) Church (Episcopal) Temperance Society, 1881.—(5) The Reform Clubs and Gospel Temperance; Osgood, Reynolds, Murphy.—(6) The Woman's Crusade, 1873-4.—(7) The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1874; ✓
Miss Frances Willard, - - - - - 221

II.

CHAPTER VIII. LEGAL AND POLITICAL MEASURES
SINCE THE WAR.

- Changed Conditions.—The Prohibition Party.—(1) Citizens' Law and Order League, 1877.—(2) The High-License Policy, Nebraska, 1881.—(3) The Dispensary System, South Carolina, 1893; The Gothenburg System.—(4) State Constitutional Prohibition: Kansas, 1881; Iowa, 1882; Maine, 1884; Rhode Island, 1886; North and South Dakota, 1889; Defeated in Other States; Aggregate Vote.—(5) National Constitutional Prohibition labored for; Blair and Colquitt.—(6) The National League for the Suppression of the Liquor Traffic, 1885.—(7) The Anti-Saloon Republican Movement, 1886-88.—(8) The National Anti-Saloon League, 1895, - - - - - 248

III.

CHAPTER IX. GROUND WON AND GROUND OF
CONFLICT.

	PAGE
I. Total Abstinence.—Ethics of Moderation.—Science and Alcohol.—II. Legislative Suppression of Public Traffic.—Philosophy and Results of So-called Substitutes for the Saloon.—Ground of Conflict.—Is Public Sentiment Sufficiently Advanced to Sustain Prohibitory Laws?—Probable Seat of Trouble, - - - - -	279

D. ADJUDICATION.

I.

CHAPTER X. THE ALLEGED FAILURES OF
PROHIBITION.

Twofold Cause for Lack of Complete Success of Prohibition. — First, <i>Area</i> . Handicap of Local Option, and of State Prohibition.—United States Supreme Court Decisions Bearing on Interstate Commerce, 1888, 1890.—Ethics of Local Option Principle.—Second, <i>Method</i> . Laws Passed by Non-partisan Method Enforced by Party Method.—Difficulties and Failures, - - - - -	315
---	-----

II.

CHAPTER XI. THE LESSONS OF EXPERIENCE.—
A TEMPERANCE CONSTITUENCY.

Conclusions from So-called Failures of Prohibition.—Personal and Political Morals.—Consistent Non-partisanship the Key to Success.—A Temperance Constituency, - - - - -	357
---	-----

III.

CHAPTER XII. THE PROHIBITION PARTY
MOVEMENT.

	PAGE
Nature and Function of a Political Party.—Perver- sion in Practice: Party Prejudice.—Prohibition Party Vote.—The Most Stubborn Obstacle in the Entire Reform.—Ground of Hope.—The Imme- diate Program, - - - - -	385

A. AGITATION.

17

(I.)

CHAPTER I.

THE AWAKENING: MODERATION.

1785-1826.

“O madness! to think use of strongest wines
And strongest drinks our chief support of health,
When God, with these forbidden, made choice to rear
His mighty champion, strong above compare,
Whose drink was only from the limpid brook.”

A HUNDRED years ago nearly everybody took something. Liquor was to be found on every side-board. Besides the grogshop, every grocery sold it, and no tavern was without it. Freer was its use than water by the human species.

It was the regular table beverage in the family, and was invariably pressed upon caller and guest. The doctor in his calls upon the sick, the minister in his round of parish duties, everywhere partook of the recruiting drink. To refuse on such occasion to drink with the lady of the house, had such thing been thought of, would have been a discourtesy, even an insult. It was the universal mark of

hospitality. At a christening, a wedding, a funeral; at balls, parties, huskings, a barn or house-raising; at town-meetings, musters, cattle-shows, fairs; at the dedication of a meeting-house, the ordination or installation of a minister, or any other transaction or assembly whatever, whether private or public, social or business, custom demanded that there must be something to drink.

But not merely as an agency for promoting sociability—or solemnity, as the case might be—did liquor serve in that day; it was believed that man could not really do hard work without it. Mechanics and laboring men were provided with a daily ration of spirits, to which the town bell summoned them at four and at eleven, as regularly as meals were provided at other hours. The farmer, during harvest and haying time, kept his help in the field constantly supplied with a bottle of whisky or New England rum. The man who could n't drink was not supposed to be of much account when it came to hard work. This beverage was believed to be equally efficacious, now against the burning summer heat, now against winter's bitterest cold. Strength and staying power were

always promoted by its use. The inference that strong drink makes strong men, was perhaps not wholly unnatural. Not until the fatal effects of such belief and practice forced their damaging evidence peremptorily upon the attention of thoughtful minds, was the soundness of this view ever seriously questioned.

The liquors in use embraced all kinds. There were gin, ale, beer, wine, cider, cider-brandy, whisky, rum, and that favorite Sabbath drink, on coming home from church, flip, a drink of home-brewed beer with an infusion of spirits, sweetened and seasoned with sugar and nutmeg, and warmed with a red-hot poker. But by far the most common drink was rum. West India rum, whose manufacture followed upon the introduction of sugarcane into those islands at the middle of the seventeenth century, formed one of the chief articles of commerce in those days. A half-century later New England rum was added to the trade.

How much liquor was consumed we can not definitely compute. We have, however, some record of its results. Intemperance was widespread, with its train of want and woe. It was a common

maxim that no man was to be found who had not been drunk at least once in his life. The evil had become aggravated, and reached its climax during the epoch following the Revolutionary War. The American soldiers had been furnished with spirits by order of Congress, that they might better sustain the exposures and fatigue incident to war. With their home-coming, the unsettled condition of the country, the factions and jealousies, the spread of French skepticism, and the general low tone of morals and religion, intemperance came like a rising tide upon the land, until it came to be generally asserted that Americans drank more liquor, per capita, than any other people on earth.

It was during this period that we observe the first signs—the stir that presages an awakening. The occasional voice of warning hitherto had produced no perceptible results. The strong man had only turned over to sleep on, while the enemy was busy sowing tares.

The person who more than any other was instrumental in effecting this awakening was that distinguished American physician and citizen, Dr. Benjamin Rush, of Philadelphia. To his labors

the nineteenth-century world-wide temperance movement can be traced by lines of direct influence. Seldom is it that a reform can boast of such a birthright! A graduate of Princeton and of Edinburgh, he became a professor in the University of Pennsylvania, and attained a position of undisputed pre-eminence in the medical profession of America. The "Sydenham of America," as men called him, he was the central figure in the medical world at Philadelphia, as Cullen was at Edinburgh and Boerhaave at Leyden.

But his labors were not limited to his profession. He was the friend and promoter of every interest of humanity and religion. Among the builders of the American Republic he must be assigned a large place. Early in 1776, when a number of the Colonies had expressed themselves on the question of independence, he brought his own State, which had not yet moved, also in line for independence. A member of the Continental Congress of 1776, he was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. During the war he was physician-general in the middle department of the army, and after its close he became a mem-

ber of the Constitutional Convention of 1787. During the last fourteen years of his life he was treasurer of the United States mint. While others were interested in the growth of commerce and in the expansion of our material resources, Rush was interested in the expansion of the human mind growing out of independence and self-government. He advocated free schools and the education of women. He was one of the chief founders of Dickinson College at Carlisle, Pa., and of the Philadelphia Dispensary, the first institution of its kind in the United States, extending its blessings to thousands of the sick poor. He was one of the founders of the first anti-slavery society, in 1775, "The Society for the Relief of Free Negroes Unlawfully Held in Bondage." He was one of the founders, also, of the Philadelphia Bible Society. He advocated the use of the Bible in the schools, and strenuously opposed capital punishment except for capital offenses.

A type of the polished gentleman, a brilliant conversationalist and generous host, Rush never neglected his duties to the sick, nor disdained to minister to the humblest. During his more than

thirty years as attending physician in the Philadelphia Hospital he is said never to have missed his daily visit. He rendered large gratuitous service to the poor, and exhorted his students to be especially attentive to them, quoting Boerhaave that "he esteemed them his best patients, for God was their paymaster." His prescriptions were not confined to doses of medicine, but to the regulation of diet, air, dress, exercise, and mental condition of his patients, as an aid to the curing or preventing of disease.

It is from this man, holding medals and honors from the crowned heads of Europe, whose activities covered so wide a field, whose interests were so humanitarian,—it is from this man that the drinking customs of society received their first effectual rebuke. His pen, so busy on other themes also, arrested attention. The fullness of time had, it seems, come.

His "Inquiry into the Effects of Ardent Spirits on the Human Body and Mind" appeared in 1785. This date is the starting point in temperance chronology. The inquiry was directed to ardent spirits only—the distilled liquors, the most manifest evil

of the day. Fermented liquors containing as they do only a comparatively small percentage of alcohol, it was thought that they could but seldom be drunk in sufficient quantities to produce intoxication. The pamphlet enumerates the immediate effects in a fit of drunkenness, the symptoms of "this odious disease:" unusual garrulity or silence; captiousness and a disposition to quarrel; uncommon good humor; profane swearing and cursing; a disclosure of secrets; a rude disposition to tell persons their faults in company; certain immodest actions; a clipping of words; fighting, hallooing, singing, roaring, imitating the noise of brute animals; jumping, tearing off clothes, dancing naked, breaking glasses and china, and dashing other articles of household furniture upon the floor. The paroxysm of drunkenness is at length completely formed. "The face now becomes flushed, the eyes project and are somewhat watery, winking is less frequent than natural; the underlip is protruded, the head inclines a little to one shoulder, the jaw falls, belching and hiccough take place, the limbs totter—the whole body staggers. The unfortunate subject of this history falls on his seat; he looks

around him with a vacant countenance, and mutters inarticulate sounds to himself; he attempts to rise and walk." He falls on his side, rolls on his back, now closes his eyes and falls into a heavy sleep. In this condition he lies from ten, twelve, and twenty-four hours, to two, three, four, and five days, an object of pity and disgust. His recovery from this fit of intoxication is marked by several peculiar appearances. "He opens his eyes and closes them again, he gapes and stretches his limbs, he then coughs and pukes, his voice is hoarse, he rises with difficulty, and staggers to his chair, his eyes resemble balls of fire, his hands tremble, he loathes the sight of food, he calls for a glass of spirits to compose his stomach, now and then he emits a deep-fetched sigh or groan from a transient twinge of conscience; but he more frequently scolds and curses everything around him. In this state of languor and stupidity he remains for two or three days before he is able to resume his former habits of business and conversation."

The chronic effects of the habitual use of ardent spirits are next mentioned—decay of appetite; sickness at stomach; vomiting of bile; obstructions

of the liver; jaundice and dropsy; hoarseness and a husky cough, terminating often in fatal disease of the lungs; diabetes; redness and eruptions on the body, beginning generally on the nose; fetid breath, frequent belchings; epilepsy; gout, colic, palsy, apoplexy; lastly, madness. Spirits predispose to every form of acute disease. The solitary instances of longevity, now and then, among hard drinkers “no more disprove the deadly effects of ardent spirits than the solitary instances of recovery from apparent death by drowning prove that there is no danger to life from a human body lying an hour or two under water.”

The body, after death from ardent spirits, shows upon dissection—contraction of fibers of stomach and bowels; abscesses, gangrene, and scirrhi in the viscera; contraction of bronchial vessels, blood vessels, and tendons in many parts more or less ossified.

The effects of ardent spirits upon the mind are pointed out—the impairing of the memory, weakening of the understanding, and perversion of the moral faculties—falsehood, fraud, theft, uncleanness, murder. The sorrow and shame inflicted

upon the family and kindred, the reproach upon religion, the dilapidation and impoverishment of house and possessions, are here pictured.

The arguments employed to support the common use of ardent spirits are then taken up: 1. That they are necessary in very cold weather. The author shows that the temporary warmth they produce is always followed by a greater disposition of the body to be affected by cold, and suggests that warm clothing and a good meal are a more durable method of preserving bodily heat. 2. That ardent spirits are necessary in very warm weather. Dr. Rush shows that experience proves the opposite; that spirits increase, instead of lessening the effects of heat upon the body, and thereby dispose to diseases of all kinds. He quotes the observations of Dr. Bell, "that rum, whether used habitually, moderately, or in excessive quantities in the West Indies, always diminishes the strength of the body, and renders men more susceptible of disease, and unfit for any service in which vigor or activity is required." Rush contends, "as well might we throw oil into a house, the roof of which was on fire, in order to prevent the flames from extending

to the inside, as pour ardent spirits into the stomach to lessen the effects of the hot sun upon the skin." 3. That ardent spirits sustain the body in hard labor. Dr. Rush points to the horse, "with every muscle of his body swelled from morning till night in the plow"—does he make signs for a draught of toddy, or a glass of spirits, to enable him to cleave the ground or climb a hill? No, he requires nothing but cool water and substantial food. "There is no nourishment in ardent spirits. The strength they produce in labor is of a transient nature, and is always followed by a sense of weakness and fatigue."

The only safe and reasonable course for those addicted to spirits is to abstain entirely and at once. By the use of grog and toddy men have been led to love spirits in their more destructive mixtures. "Were it possible," Rush cries, "for me to speak with a voice so loud as to be heard from the river St. Croix to the remotest shores of the Mississippi, I would say: Friends and fellow-citizens! avoid the habitual use of those two seducing liquors, whether they be made with brandy, rum, gin, Jamaica spirits, whisky, or what is called cherry bounce."

Let those in authority be petitioned to limit the number of taverns, to impose heavy duties upon ardent spirits, to inflict a mark of disgrace or temporary abridgment of civil rights upon every man convicted of drunkenness, and to place the property of habitual drunkards into the hands of trustees for the benefit of their families. Let the different Christian denominations unite to make the consumption and sale of ardent spirits a subject of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the Methodists and the Society of Friends having already for some time past viewed them as contraband articles to the pure laws of the Gospel. "Ministers of the Gospel, of every denomination in the United States, aid me with all the weight you possess in society, from the dignity and usefulness of your sacred office, to save our fellow-men from being destroyed by the great destroyer of their lives and souls."

Such a trumpet blast had never before been heard. So strong are the walls of custom that it did not, of course, lay them low at once, but it caused them to shake and become less secure, from which at length they did fall. Of all of Rush's writings this was the most widely read. The year

after its first appearance it was reprinted in the *Gentleman's Magazine* in England. Rush made continued and special efforts to extend its circulation, by presenting copies to the clergy, to religious and other bodies, and by personally urging the subject upon the attention of men. It created no immediate organized following. That day had not yet come. But it lodged deeply in men's minds, it being the first time that a man of such commanding ability and fame had ever attempted to set this subject forth in anything like a scientific form. It laid foundations for those that were to come after.

For his clear temperance convictions Dr. Rush was doubtless indebted, to some extent, to his own Quaker ancestry, and to his association with men of abstemious habits, notably the early Methodist preachers, such men as Asbury and Coke, who were frequently entertained beneath his hospitable roof. The Wesleys had taken strong grounds against the use and sale of spirituous liquors, a position to which the practice of the early preachers in that denomination generally conformed.

But one name must not be omitted—Anthony

Benezet. An exile with the Huguenots from France, he became a resident, successively, of Holland, of England (where as a boy he united with the Society of Friends), and of Philadelphia. One of the kindest of men, his philanthropic impulse drew him forth from the private pursuit of teaching and brought him before the world to advocate the cause of the oppressed. The black man found in him a warm friend and zealous champion. He first influenced Dr. Rush to take up the question of slavery, and was one of the organizers—with Rush, Franklin, and others—of the first anti-slavery society. Benezet wrote an *Historical Account of Guinea*, which fell into the hands of a young English student, Thomas Clarkson, and determined his future career as an abolitionist.

Benezet took up the cause of the Indian, and helped to form, in 1756, "The Friendly Association for Regaining and Preserving Peace with the Indians by Pacific Means." He wrote against war. On these themes he carried on a voluminous correspondence, including the royalty and nobility of Europe and the leading men in Church and State on both sides of the Atlantic. May 3, 1784,

was a day of universal grief—Benezet was dead. The day of his burial brought together the largest gathering that had ever assembled on a similar occasion in Philadelphia, and men envied the honors of Benezet above the fame of General Washington.

Both by his example and by the labors of his pen Benezet was one of the notable forerunners of the temperance reformation. A full decade before the appearance of Dr. Rush's essay Benezet had written a pamphlet against spirituous liquors, "The Mighty Destroyer Displayed," warning against the common use of any drink "which is liable to steal away a man's senses and render him foolish, irascible, uncontrollable, and dangerous."

Great changes come slowly. The period of incubation is long in proportion as the idea that is working itself out is powerful and permanent. An agreement among the farmers in Litchfield County, Connecticut, in 1789, that they would do their work in harvest without furnishing the customary spirits, shows, among other instances, that the leaven was at work.

In the autumn of 1799, a young man recently

graduated from Yale was settled as minister in the Presbyterian Church at East Hampton, Long Island. His observations, during a pastorate of eleven years at this place, prepared him to become, later, the commanding figure in the early temperance warfare. The Montauk Indians lived near East Hampton, wild tribes who for a hundred years "had resisted such efforts as were made for their evangelization, and yielded, alas! only to those which tended to degrade and destroy them." "There was a grogseller in our neighborhood," he wrote afterward, "who drank himself and corrupted others. He always kept his jug under the bed to drink in the night, till he was choked off by death. He would go down with his barrel of whisky in a wagon to the Indians and get them tipsy and bring them in debt; he would get all their corn and bring it back in his wagon—in fact, he stripped them. Then, in winter, they must come up twenty miles, buy their own corn, and pack it home on their shoulders, or starve. O! it was horrible, horrible! It burned and burned in my mind, and I swore a deep oath in my mind that it should not be so." At about this time, too, Dr. Rush's

essay fell into his hands. We shall hear of this young man again. His name is Lyman Beecher—destined to make the name famous.

In union there is strength—strength in the confidence and courage it gives the individual better to defy the customs and prejudices of a people; strength in conserving views thus held in common, and greater effectiveness in the propagation of those views. Soon after entering the new century we find the first attempts to promote temperance by organized effort. The first efforts in this direction were by no means uniform or thoroughgoing. All was yet crudest experiment. Man had not the light of experience to guide him. That something must be done, they agreed. They saw as through a glass darkly, and felt their way. The first societies were largely moderation societies simply. Men were aiming not so much at drinking as at drunkenness, and members of the early temperance societies were pledged generally against the excessive use of spirits, and in social visits, perhaps, to decline them as far as possible. Drunkenness was punished either with a fine, or by being compelled to treat all around. In one instance, after signing

the constitution, the members all took a drink at the tavern bar, where the society was organized, to show the world an example of true moderation.

One of the first distinctive temperance societies was the one formed at Moreau, in Saratoga County, New York, in 1808. This was a country place devoted to lumbering, with its strong temptations to drinking. Deeply stirred, an intrepid young physician, Billy J. Clark, in co-operation with the Congregational minister, Lebbeus Armstrong, took the initiative in this move for the community's redemption. Forty-seven signed the constitution of the temperance society, pledged to abstain from the use of ardent spirits and wine, except in case of sickness, also excepting wine at public dinners and at communion. For breaking this rule a fine of twenty-five cents was imposed, and for actual intoxication a fine of fifty cents. Dr. Benjamin Rush was made an honorary member of the society—an evidence of indebtedness to his labors.

Voices are now beginning to be heard from the pulpit. Notable among these is a sermon by Rev. Ebenezer Porter, Congregational minister at Washington, Connecticut, who was later called to a pro-

fessorship at Andover Theological Seminary. This sermon was preached in the winter of 1805-6, the occasion that drew it forth being a man found dead in the snow, with a bottle of spirits in his pocket. The sermon gave statistics on the extent of the consumption of strong drink, and its attendant evils. It warned against excessive drinking; cautioned parents against the free use of spirits in the home, and in general called upon men to have a care. The sermon awakened inquiry, and a little later was called for in pamphlet form, and circulated as a tract. In 1810, Rev. Heman Humphrey, of Fairfield, Connecticut, afterwards the president of Amherst College, preached a series of six sermons on the subject of intemperance, which are believed to be the first series ever given on this theme. The same year, Jeremiah Evarts (father of a famous son, William M. Evarts) began to call attention to the evils of intemperance in the columns of the *Panoplist and Missionary Magazine*, of which he was the editor. Rev. Roswell Swan, of Norwalk, and Rev. Calvin Chapin, of Rocky Hill, Connecticut, whose voice was also heard soon after this, were among the very first to advocate entire absti-

nence from spirits as the only remedy for intemperance.

The year 1811 is an important date in the history of the temperance movement. The question of intemperance was now to be taken up by the Churches, and to form henceforth the theme of discussion in ecclesiastical meetings. The immediate agency in bringing this about was, again, Dr. Benjamin Rush. At the regular session of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, convened in Philadelphia in May of that year, Dr. Rush presented that body with one thousand copies of his essay on ardent spirits, which had already passed through several editions. He made an earnest appeal for some action by the Assembly, and induced that body to appoint a committee to devise measures for combating the prevailing intemperance, the committee to report at the next annual meeting. The committee thus appointed visited, or corresponded with, the General Associations of Congregational Churches in the different New England States that summer and fall, and secured the appointment of like committees by each, to make a similar report at their respective ecclesiastical

gatherings the following year. Thus did this famous Philadelphia physician and citizen, on the eve of his going hence (he died within two years), render effectual the labors of his life, and launch a cause freighted with untold blessings to mankind.

The Committee on Temperance appointed by the Assembly the preceding year made a comprehensive report to the Presbyterian General Assembly of 1812. The report did not explicitly recommend entire abstinence, but came close to it. Ministers were urged to warn their members and hearers "not only against actual intemperance, but against all those habits and indulgences which may have a tendency to produce it," and by sermons, addresses, and tracts to create public sentiment, "or a suitable impression against the use of ardent spirits." In 1818 the General Assembly declared against the custom of treating, "except in extraordinary cases," and planted itself on the principle that men ought to abstain from the common use of ardent spirits.

A perceptible influence became manifest in the Methodist Church also at this time. The practice of this Church with respect to temperance had

steadily declined for more than two decades, until now it had reached its lowest level. Drinking had become quite general among its members, and was not infrequent among its clergy; while many members, and not a few preachers, were among those who dealt in ardent spirits. The year 1812 marks the turning point from this condition. The General Conference of that year—the first representative or delegated General Conference—took up the subject in an address to the Church. “It is with regret that we have seen the use of ardent spirits, dram-drinking, etc., so common among the Methodists. We have endeavored to suppress the practice by our example, but it is necessary that we add precept to example. And we really think it not consistent with the character of a Christian to be immersed in the practice of distilling or retailing an article so destructive to the morals of society, and we do most earnestly recommend the Annual Conferences and our people to join with us in making a firm and constant stand against the evil which has ruined thousands both in time and in eternity.” At subsequent quadrennial Conferences the subject was constantly agitated, conspicuously by the ener-

getic Rev. James Axley, and the Discipline became gradually more stringent.

A tremor was felt in other bodies also. But the developments of chiefest importance were those among the Congregational Churches in Connecticut and in Massachusetts. The General Association of Connecticut met in June of 1812 at Sharon. A committee of three on Temperance, appointed the year before upon overtures by the committee of the Presbyterian General Assembly already mentioned, brought in its report. Deploring the widespread evils of intemperance, the committee confessed that after the most prayerful consideration they did not see that anything could be done. Whereupon Rev. Lyman Beecher, recently settled at Litchfield, rose instantly to his feet, moved that the committee be discharged, and another committee of three be appointed, to report at that same meeting the ways and means of arresting the tide of intemperance. Beecher, as chairman, brought in a report the next day—the most important paper, he says afterwards, that he ever wrote. It recommended—

1. Sermons on the subject by all ministers of the Association.

2. That District Associations put away spirituous liquors from ecclesiastical meetings.

3. That Church members abstain from unlawful vending, or from purchase and use when unlawfully vended; and to cease using spirits as a means of hospitality.

4. That parents cease from the ordinary use of ardent spirits in the family, and warn their children against the dangers of intemperance.

5. That farmers and mechanics and manufacturers substitute palatable and nutritious drinks, and give additional compensation, if necessary, to their employees.

6. To circulate documents on the subject, especially a sermon by Rev. Ebenezer Porter, and Dr. Rush's essay.

7. To form voluntary associations to aid civil magistrates in the execution of the law.

The report called upon the Association "most earnestly to entreat their brethren in the ministry, the members of our Churches, and the persons who lament and desire to check the progress of this evil, that they neither express nor indulge the melancholy apprehension that nothing can be done on

this subject, a prediction eminently calculated to paralyze exertion, and to become the disastrous cause of its own fulfillment." Such spirit had in it an augury of a better day. "Our cause is indeed an evil one, but not hopeless." The report, after a discussion of unwonted zeal and earnestness, was adopted, and a thousand copies were ordered to be printed.

At the next year's Association the reports were most encouraging. Spirits had been banished from ecclesiastical meetings; ministers had preached, and Churches generally approved; the use of spirits in the family had diminished; the attention of the community was awakened, and the current of public opinion was beginning to turn; a "Society for the Reformation of Morals" had been organized, and ecclesiastical bodies in other States had commenced efforts against the common enemy.

Chief among the last named bodies was the General Association of Massachusetts. Here too a temperance committee had been appointed at the meeting in 1811, with Rev. Samuel Worcester, of Salem, as chairman. After several meetings and conferences with others, an organization was ef-

fectcd, in February, 1813, called "The Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance." Its object was "to discountenance and suppress the too free use of ardent spirits and its kindred vices, profaneness and gaming; and to encourage and promote temperance and general morality." Hon. Samuel Dexter, a distinguished Boston lawyer, who had been both Secretary of the Treasury and Secretary of War in Adams's Cabinet, was elected president of the society. This organization, if not the most advanced in its principles, was yet the largest and most important society that had thus far been brought into being. At each annual meeting a sermon dealing with intemperance was preached by some well-known clergyman. In the third annual report, for the year 1815, thirty-three societies were reported organized in the different parts of the Commonwealth, auxiliary to this parent society.

During the next ten years the leaven was working on, slowly on the whole, but surely. No distinct or notable achievement is recorded for these years in the temperance reform. The War of 1812 had brought its distracting influence, while the

Congregational Churches in New England, from whose ranks the chief impulse to early temperance came, were absorbed, since 1815, in a spirited controversy over Unitarianism. Sermons on temperance, however, became more frequent, and local temperance societies slowly multiplied, with rules varying in scope and strictness. Here and there a Church was beginning to refuse membership to any who used or dealt in spirits. The press, too, was now and then clearing its throat as if to speak. Among the publications of this time was a pamphlet or book by Rev. Mason L. Weems, late rector of General Washington's parish, and author of a "Life of Washington." By 1818 it had passed through six editions in as many years. Its title was "The Drunkard's Looking Glass," "wherein the American youth may behold a most terrific yet true picture of that monster vice, which every year swallows up more precious life, property, and character in the United States than do the French, the British, the yellow fever, and all our enemies (public and private) put together."

Another pamphlet was in the form of an address to the people of the United States, "The In-

tellectual Torch," by Dr. Jesse Torrey, Jr., which developed an original plan for the dissemination of knowledge and virtue by means of free public libraries. "While in health taste not a single drop of ardent spirits," it urged in a chapter on strong drink. The author circulated petitions to the President and to Congress, to provide legislation for this purpose; and for the purpose of discouraging intemperance to levy a tax of fifty cents a gallon upon native spirits, and of one dollar upon wines and spirits imported. Mr. Weems, in his pamphlet just quoted, in addition to more religious training, also advocates taxation. So specious is this taxation argument that it has not failed to captivate and carry away even the very elect. Could a heavy tax but be laid on the twenty-five million gallons of spirits distilled annually in the United States, so it was argued by Weems, what a revenue "to scatter in blessings through the land, improving the canals and roads, encouraging the arts and sciences, multiplying churches and free schools, and thus rendering our country the delight and glory of the earth!" The fallacy and mischief of this policy as a temperance measure was to be

amply demonstrated when, in the later stages of the reform, it was put into actual operation.

A pioneer work in every reform is the gathering of facts. It is facts alone which can break down the barriers of custom and prejudice. All theories and notions and philosophies must give way before facts. In the use of this method of presenting facts and actual results, and of drawing logical, masterful deductions therefrom, no man exceeded, or perhaps equaled, the Rev. Justin Edwards, of Andover, Massachusetts. It was he who was to give the chief impetus in starting the temperance reform upon a new epoch presently. In 1825 appeared a pamphlet by Dr. Edwards, entitled, "The Well-conducted Farm." This was widely circulated as a tract—No. 176, in the American Tract Society's series. It gave the results of the banishment of strong drink from the extensive farming establishment of S. V. S. Wilder, Esq., at Bolton, in Worcester County. The advantages accruing to the workmen from the practice of abstinence were shown to have been: better appetite for food, with greater vigor of body and mind; they were freer from sickness, doing more work and

with greater ease; accumulating more property, happier. The advantages to the employer were: the men did more work, and did it better; the premises were kept in better repair, and things were in their place; the farm was better worked, and the crops gathered in better season; the dumb animals, under kinder treatment, were more gentle; the men were more respectful in deportment, more contented, more interested in religion and in the welfare of all about them. It was then pointed out what beneficial results would follow if the principle of abstinence were adopted throughout the country.

At this point, where the twilight of the old passes over into the dawn of a new day, stand the famous Six Sermons by Rev. Lyman Beecher. They were preached during the last year of Beecher's pastorate at Litchfield, in 1825, and were repeated soon after his settlement in the Hanover Street Church in Boston, where he went in March, 1826. The immediate occasion that drew them forth was a convert's relapse on strong drink at a country place, called Bradleysville, about four miles out from Litchfield. Beecher used to preach

there on Sunday afternoons, and on the occasion of this visit there he found the young man in bed, and his wife weeping. He took in the situation at once, and riding home said to himself, "It is now or never." He immediately worked out six sermons "on the Nature, Occasions, Signs, Evils, and Remedy of Intemperance," which were printed in a year or two, then translated into several tongues, and circulated over the face of the earth. They did more than any other single similar agency in creating a distinct temperance sentiment, and for years afterwards were looked upon as the standard authority on this subject.

Beecher's language is unequivocal. "The time is not distant, we trust, when the use of ardent spirits will be proscribed by a vote of all the Churches in our land, and the commerce in that article shall, equally with the slave-trade, be regarded as inconsistent with a creditable profession of Christianity." He had a profound grasp of the subject, and recognized far in advance some of the later real difficulties of the problem. Spread information, he urges, concerning the effects of spirits, and form voluntary associations for absti-

nence. Yet these will not prove sufficient. Something more than knowledge or argument will be needed; thirst and the love of filthy lucre are incorrigible. The disease is deep-seated. There is somewhere a mighty energy of evil at work in the production of intemperance. Intemperance in our land is not accidental; it is rolling in upon us by the violation of some great laws of human nature. The remedy must lie in the application of correct principles, and must be universal, national. What is this remedy? "It is the banishment of ardent spirits from the list of lawful articles of commerce by a correct and efficient public sentiment, such as has turned slavery out of half our land, and will yet expel it from the world."

And the evening and the morning were the first day.

(II.)

CHAPTER II.

PROGRESSION: ABSTINENCE.

1826-1851.

First Period: 1826-1836. Abstinence from Spirits.

ON February 13, 1826, "The American Society for the Promotion of Temperance" was formed in Boston. This marks a new epoch in the reform. The hapless, unfruitful labors of the years previous had taught their lesson. Out of the varied experimenting one conclusion was beginning to stand out with growing clearness; namely, that the only practical, effective remedy for intemperance is entire abstinence. The philosophy of moderation was daily demonstrating its failure. Temperance men had hitherto sought, for the most part, to regulate the use of strong drink, not to abolish it. They had bewailed the effect, yet perpetuated the cause. While one reformed drunkard was being saved, their own habits, if followed by others, would make twenty more.

Consequently, in spite of all pledges and labors of moderation, intemperance went on apace. Not that men wanted to be drunken, or did not recognize the voice of reason, but because there is something in the very nature of strong drink that leads to excess. A little drinking tempts to more drinking, which men can not or do not resist; which results in intoxication; which tends to repeat itself; which ends in confirmed drunkenness. Men were thus beginning to see that to combat drunkenness efforts must be directed against the habit of drinking itself, the root "from which this upas-tree springs." But to bring about such a change in public sentiment and custom demanded larger plans and means of work than had yet been employed. After prayer and consultation on this subject, by a few earnest men, a conference was called of representatives of the various Christian denominations, to meet in Boston on January 10, 1826. At this meeting it was resolved that systematic and vigorous efforts on a larger scale be put forth, commensurate with the evil, and continued until it is eradicated; that to this end an American Temperance Society be organized, and a permanent sal-

aried agent employed to give his entire time to the work. At an adjourned meeting, on February 13th, a constitution was adopted, and the following persons were chosen by the members of the meeting to constitute the Society: Rev. Leonard Woods, Rev. William Jenks, Rev. Justin Edwards, Rev. Warren Fay, Rev. Benjamin B. Wisner, Rev. Francis Wayland, Rev. Timothy Merritt, Hon. Marcus Morton, Hon. Samuel Hubbard, Hon. William Reed, Hon. George Odiorne, John Tappan, Esq., William Ropes, Esq., S. V. S. Wilder, Esq., James P. Chaplin, M. D., and Enoch Hale, M. D. At its first meeting, the Society elected Hon. Marcus Morton as its president, and Leonard Woods, Justin Edwards, John Tappan, George Odiorne, and S. V. S. Wilder as the Executive Committee. At the second meeting eighty-four men from the Middle and Northern States were chosen as additional members of the Society.

Though the basis of this Society was really entire abstinence from ardent spirits, it was not explicitly so stated at first in the constitution, nor was it exacted as a pledge, for motives of prudence, doubtless. The original object, as stated

in the constitution, was "to produce such a change of public sentiment, and such a renovation of the habits of individuals and the customs of the community, that in the end temperance, with all its attendant blessings, may universally prevail." To accomplish this object, one of the modes of operation proposed was "to do whatever is practicable and expedient toward the forming of voluntary associations, for the purpose of promoting the ends of the Society." The first such association, or temperance society, however, planted itself squarely on entire abstinence. This was the society at Andover, the home of Justin Edwards, organized on September 1st of that same year. Entire abstinence became thenceforward the accepted principle of societies that were later formed under the auspices of this parent Society. The Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance, which since its organization in 1813 had stood upon a platform of moderation, and whose work had for a number of years languished, in November, 1827, recommended the practice of entire abstinence, making it a few years later a part of its constitution.

The first permanent general agent of the American Temperance Society was Rev. Nathaniel Hewit, of Fairfield, Connecticut. Hewit was a man of great power over an audience, and was already known to have preached with effect on the subject of temperance. During his three years' service he visited the New England and many of the Middle and Southern States, addressing Churches, conferences, ecclesiastical and other bodies. He wrought effectually in those pioneer days, and has been called the Luther of the early temperance reform. Under the general agent, State and district agents were appointed. The work grew, and societies sprang up everywhere.

The labors of the American Temperance Society were powerfully re-enforced by addresses and publications of various kinds. Early in 1828, Rev. Calvin Chapin had begun, with caustic pen, a series of thirty-three articles in the *Connecticut Observer*, on "The Only Infallible Antidote"—entire abstinence, the truth of which was strikingly illustrated. On March 4th, the same year, less than a month after the American Temperance Society was organized, there appeared in Boston

the first paper ever established to advocate entire abstinence, *The National Philanthropist*. It was founded by Rev. William Collier, a Baptist minister, a graduate of Brown University. Its motto was, Temperate drinking is the down-hill road to drunkenness. After the second month it became a regular weekly paper. A few years later it was edited for a time by William Lloyd Garrison, who wrote: "When this paper was first proposed it met with a repulsion which would have utterly discouraged a less zealous and persevering man than our predecessor. The moralist looked on doubtfully; the whole community esteemed the enterprise desperate. By extraordinary efforts and under appalling disadvantages the first number was given to the public, and since that time it has gradually expanded in size and increased in circulation till doubt and prejudice and ridicule have been swept away." That a paper directly devoted to temperance might become a power in the reform had evidently not occurred to the people.

Early in 1827 the country was stirred by an address given at Lyme, New Hampshire, on Janu-

ary 8th, by Jonathan Kittredge, one of the ablest lawyers and jurists of his generation. It was a fearful indictment of moderate drinking, and created a great sensation. He speaks thus: "But we are apt to think that the wretches whom we see and have described were always so; that they were out of miserable and degraded families; and that they are walking in the road in which they were born. But this is not so. Among the number may be found a large proportion who were as lovely in their infancy, as promising in their youth, and as useful in early life, as your own children, and have become drunkards—I repeat it, and let it never be forgotten—*have become drunkards by the temperate, moderate, and habitual use of ardent spirits, just as you use them now.* Were it not for this use of ardent spirits, we should not now hear of drunken senators and drunken magistrates, of drunken lawyers and drunken doctors; Churches would not now be mourning over drunken ministers and drunken members; parents would not now be weeping over drunken children, wives over drunken husbands, husbands over drunken wives, and angels over a drunken world.

"He who advises men not to drink to excess

may lop off the branches; he who advises them to drink only on certain occasions may fell the trunk; but he who tells them not to drink at all strikes and digs deep for the roots of the hideous vice of intemperance; and this is the only course to pursue. . . . Let those who can not be reclaimed go to ruin, and the quicker the better if you regard only the public good; but save the rest of our population; save yourselves; save your children! Raise not up an army of drunkards to supply their places! Purify your houses! They contain the plague of death—the poison that in a few years will render some of your little ones what the miserable wretches that you see staggering the streets are now. . . . As long as you keep ardent spirits in your houses, as long as you drink it yourselves, as long as it is polite and genteel to sip the intoxicating bowl, so long society will remain just what it is now and so long drunkards will spring from your loins, and so long drunkards will wear your names to future generations. And there is no way given under heaven whereby man can be saved from the vice of intemperance but that of *total abstinence*.”

This address was issued by the American Tract Society as No. 221 in their series, and was spread abroad by the hundred thousands. A little later, the same year, came the famous address by Reuben D. Mussey, Professor of Anatomy and Surgery at Dartmouth, before the New Hampshire Medical Society, of which he was president. This address, too, insisting that spirits are not essential to health, or indispensable even in medicine, was widely read, and made a deep impression. About this time also, Beecher's Six Sermons appeared in print, and entered upon their world-wide mission. Among the other effective publications during the first five years following the formation of the American Temperance Society were: "Discourses on Intemperance," by Rev. John Palfrey, of Boston; "Effects of Spirituous Liquors on Society," by S. Emlen, M. D., of Philadelphia; "Twelve Essays on Intemperance," by Rev. Albert Barnes, of Morristown, New Jersey, later of Philadelphia; a masterly "Parallel between Intemperance and the Slave Trade," by Heman Humphrey, D. D., President of Amherst; "Putnam and the Wolf," an address by Rev. John

Marsh, of Haddam, Connecticut, given at Pomfret, where the famous hunt by this Revolutionary hero took place; Professor Edward Hitchcock's "Argument against the Manufacture of Spirits," and "Prize Essay on Alcoholic and Narcotic Substances;" Professor Moses Stuart's prize essay on the subject, "Is the Use of Distilled Liquors and the Traffic in Them at Present Compatible with a Profession of the Christian Religion?" Addresses by Dr. Thomas Sewall in Washington, General Lewis Cass in Detroit, and Rev. Mr. McIlvaine in Brooklyn; lastly, the Annual Reports of the American Temperance Society.

At the opening of the '30's the Churches had largely planted themselves on the principle of entire abstinence. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, on an awakening conscience, had appointed the fourth Thursday of January, 1829, as a day of fasting and prayer, which was generally observed, even outside that denomination. The House of Representatives of the New York Legislature adjourned for that day, to attend worship in a body, in the city of Albany. Extensive revivals of religion followed. This was in

fact true wherever temperance activity had made itself felt. Merchants gave up the sale of ardent spirits in their stores, distillers and retailers abandoned the business entirely, under the stress of moral conviction. Young men who could be induced to abandon the cup were more easily brought under the influence of religion. So manifestly was this the case everywhere that the temperance reformation came to be called the John the Baptist of the Gospel.

A large service was rendered to temperance, particularly in his own denomination, by Wilbur Fisk, one of the best educated and strongest preachers in the Methodist Church in his day. He threw himself into the temperance movement at the very commencement of this epoch, and gave his active support to the American Temperance Society when his denomination yet stood aloof. In his persistent effort to free the Methodist Church from the venders of ardent spirits, he encountered no little hostility, and persecution even, but he won out. In 1832 he sent out his "Address to the members of the Methodist Church on the subject of Temperance," to induce those who still

refused to come over to abandon the business. "The Christian's dramshop! Sound it to yourself," he protests, in mingled indignation and appeal. Two years before this he had been elected president of Wesleyan University, just established at Middletown, Connecticut—the first president of this first Methodist university.

Many college presidents entered actively into the early reform. There were, Francis Wayland, of Brown University; Eliphalet Nott, of Union College; Heman Humphrey, of Amherst; Mark Hopkins, of Williams; Jesse Appleton, of Bowdoin; Nathan Lord, of Dartmouth; and Jeremiah Day, of Yale. Of these Heman Humphrey was the first to advocate entire abstinence, years before the American Temperance Society was formed. Eliphalet Nott became a zealous temperance advocate contemporaneous with the organization of that Society. Both as an educator and a pulpit orator Nott was unsurpassed. In July, 1804, upon invitation by the Common Council of Albany, where he served as pastor, he preached a memorial discourse upon the death of Alexander Hamilton, a personal friend and a frequent at-

tendant at his Church. The discourse became famous, being, in the language of a contemporary journalist, "one of the most eloquent and highly finished productions of the kind which this country has produced." This same year Dr. Nott was called to the presidency of Union College at Schenectady, then in its infancy; in which capacity he served an unprecedented term of sixty-two years—a man of wide and varied learning, the oracle of student and of statesman, conspicuous early advocate of the temperance and anti-slavery reforms. In the terrific and telling vividness with which he pictured the evils of intemperance he was excelled by no man.

With such men leading, or lending their aid to the reform; with Churches standing on abstinence, or coming over, and medical societies declaring for it; with thousands abandoning the traffic in ardent spirits before the sweep of a mighty conviction, and many more thousands, by their practice of abstinence, putting to shame the argument that strong drink makes men strong, and is essential to health—the temperance movement was bound to grow, and presently to become

irresistible. Already Europe, looking on from across the water, had caught the inspiration. In Ireland, Rev. John Edgar, a Presbyterian minister and Professor of Divinity at Belfast College, became the leader of the movement. Having been in communication with the friends of temperance in America, he published an article in the *Belfast News-Letter*, August 14, 1829, pointing out the need for temperance work in Ireland. This is the first appeal made on this subject to the Christian conscience of Europe. Soon after this appeal, the first temperance society in Ireland was started at Newross by Rev. George W. Carr. The movement then began to spread. Almost simultaneously, in Scotland, Mr. John Dunlop, a Greenock squire, who had studied the American temperance societies, and had become deeply impressed with the evils that flowed from the Scotchman's love of whisky, formed a society at Greenock, in October, 1829. Dunlop lectured in Edinburgh and other cities, and everywhere temperance societies sprang up. From here the movement spread to England. Mr. Henry Forbes, a merchant from Bradford, in Yorkshire, on a busi-

ness trip to Glasgow attended the public meetings of the temperance societies there. He became convinced of the necessity and worth of temperance reform and after his return he organized, on February 2, 1830, the Bradford Temperance Society, the first in England. Societies were formed during the same year in Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, and other of the larger cities of England, the reform entering London the following year, in the formation of the London Temperance Society in June, 1831.

In Sweden, also, it was heard that temperance societies had been established in America, and were working such good results. The Royal Swedish Patriotic Society at Stockholm became interested, and instructed their secretary, in May, 1830, to open communication with a view to ascertaining the plan of organization and work of these societies. Early in 1831 the first temperance society was formed, in Stockholm.

In the United States the years from 1831 to 1836 were most fruitful in the reform. The movement was getting under way and gathering momentum. First among the many agencies that

gave it impulse was the Rev. Justin Edwards, who, as corresponding secretary of the American Temperance Society during these years, became the chief promoter of organized temperance in America. As a discerning thinker, efficient organizer, and wise leader, Dr. Edwards was the ablest man at this early stage of the reform. More than any other he had been instrumental in the formation of the American Temperance Society, in collecting funds for the employment of a general agent, and in promoting in other ways, in the beginning, the cause of that organization. Upon the resignation of Rev. Nathaniel Hewit, at the close of 1830, as general agent of the Society, Dr. Edwards assumed the chief labors of that office, visiting many States, including the Province of New Brunswick in Canada, and everywhere organizing temperance societies.

The publications during these years were numerous. It was the golden age of temperance literature. The public lyceums, for discussions, debates, and lectures, which originated in Massachusetts in 1826-28, and spread presently through the land, were giving publicity and aid to the re-

form. Temperance newspapers were growing in numbers and influence. In the form of tract or pamphlet, the press was sending forth by the million copies such writings as these: Poems and Tales by Mrs. Sigourney; Addresses by Rev. Austin Dickinson; "Who Slew All These?" by Mrs. Halsey, circulated by the hundred thousands; the Ox Sermon—from Exodus xxi, 28, 29—by Rev. Eli Merrill, of which two million copies circulated in 1833; Address by President Heman Humphrey, on "The Dialogue between the Rum-seller and His Conscience;" "The Burning of the Ephesian Books," by Rev. John Pierpont, the fearless, resolute Boston Unitarian minister and poet, so valiant in the reform; Sermons by Rev. E. N. Kirk, of Albany, later of Boston, one of the most powerful preachers of his day; "The Immorality of the Traffic in Ardent Spirits," by Rev. Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia; Essays by Hon. Mark Doolittle, of New Hampshire, and by Dr. Harvey Lindley, of Washington; and lastly, and perhaps most effective of all, the Temperance Tales by Sargent. Lucius M. Sargent was a college graduate, trained for the law, but having

money resources and literary tastes he devoted himself to the temperance reform. His *Tales*, beginning in 1833 with "My Mother's Gold Ring," came forth in numbered succession, a score of them in the space of a few years. Dr. Charles Jewett, who entered the reform at the close of the '30's, wrote afterwards that if all opposition to the liquor system could by one blow be annihilated, and with it all temperance men and women then living, together with every publication or instrumentality that had ever assailed the system, saving only from the wreck Lyman Beecher's *Six Sermons*, Sargent's *Tales*, and "The Rum Fiend," a poem by William H. Burleigh, a few years later,—these alone ought, among any civilized people who can read, to originate another temperance reform, and carry it to a consummation.

Of all the publications the greatest excitement was aroused by "Deacon Amos Giles's Distillery: A Dream," by Rev. George B. Cheever, of Salem, Massachusetts, a college classmate of Hawthorne and of Longfellow. This publicity was due partly to the document itself, but more largely probably to the fact that its author, because of it, became

a kind of martyr to the cause. In this town, where Cheever had settled, there were four distilleries whose lurid flames burned day and night, week-day and Sabbath, pouring forth desolation upon the community. Within a few minutes walk from the minister's study was a workhouse, of whose three thousand inmates the vast proportion were there, directly or indirectly, owing to intemperance. Over these evils and Sabbath desecrations this young minister could not sleep. When he lay down it was only to dream, which in this instance proved to be not all a dream. His mind having in its waking hours stored up the visual impression, "Inquire at So-and-So's," seen in familiar advertisements, mingled this in strange incongruity in his dream. Imps had entered by night, so he dreamed, into the distillery of one Amos Giles, a deacon, who also kept Bibles for sale in one corner of his establishment, and in their fiendish revelry had painted signs on the casks, reading on this wise: "Who hath woe? Inquire at Deacon Giles's Distillery. Delirium Tremens? Inquire at Deacon Giles's Distillery. Insanity and Murder? Inquire at Deacon Giles's Distil-

lery," etc. These letters were invisible to the distiller, but flamed out in letters of red as the retailer was about to deal out the contents. This Dream was first published in the Salem *Landmark*, in February, 1835. Cheever was arrested for libel by one of the distillers of the town, whom the coat seemed to fit best, and although Cheever was defended by Rufus Choate, he was punished with a fine and with imprisonment at thirty days. This gave the widest publicity to the article, and was the means, by the sentiment it created, of closing the distillery. The gods were seemingly on the side of the reform, for they first made the distiller mad.

So much for the literature of these years, from 1831-1836, the second five years since the formation of the American Temperance Society. We will now note briefly the events of progress during these same years. In the fifth Annual Report of the American Temperance Society, in 1832, the following figures are given, according to the best information then obtainable: More than 1,500,000 people in the United States abstain from ardent spirits, and from furnishing it; more than 4,000

temperance societies are in existence, with more than 500,000 members; more than 1,500 distilleries have stopped, and more than 4,000 grocers have ceased selling; 4,500 drunkards have ceased using spirits, and many thousands have united with Churches as the result of giving up drinking. Every State has a State temperance society, except three. Temperance societies have been introduced into various parts of Africa, and into the Sandwich Islands.

In the fall of the same year, November 5, 1832, an order was issued by General Lewis Cass, the Secretary of War, banishing the spirit ration from the army, and prohibiting the introduction of spirituous liquors into any camp, fort, or garrison of the United States. The Secretary of the Navy bore testimony to the evils of strong drink in the service, and offered a money substitute for the grog ration to all who would accept it. The cholera plague, which came like a scourge upon the Nation in 1832, was made to praise the temperance reform, for it visibly picked its victims, as was pointed out, from the ranks of the drinker. Those who fled to the bottle were the first to succumb.

On February 26, 1833, on previous recommendation by the American Temperance Society, simultaneous temperance mass-meetings were held throughout the land and in Europe, to make a powerful impression upon the public in the furtherance of the cause of temperance. On that day, at a meeting of the members of Congress, the American Congressional Temperance Society was formed, on the basis of total abstinence from spirits, and from the traffic therein. Hon. Lewis Cass, the Secretary of War, was made president of the society. Many distinguished members of both houses of Congress and other Government officials became members of the society. Earlier in the same month Rev. Justin Edwards, the corresponding secretary of the American Temperance Society, had addressed the members of Congress, upon their invitation, on the subject of temperance; which was followed, during the same week, by a rousing mass-meeting in the hall of the House of Representatives. The fervid speeches made on this occasion were printed and scattered abroad, and gave impetus to the reform. Following the example of Congress, in a number of States legislative temperance societies were formed.

During this same year—1833—the first National Temperance Convention, pursuant to a call by the American Temperance Society, met in Philadelphia the last week in May. The object of this gathering was to consider the means of extending, by the general diffusion of information and the exertion of moral influence, the principle of abstinence from ardent spirits throughout the country. Twenty-one States were represented, with over four hundred delegates, including also a delegate from the London Temperance Society, or the British and Foreign Temperance Society, as it was renamed soon after its organization. Hon. Reuben Walworth, Chancellor of the State of New York, presided over this convention. Distinguished men sat in the convention, and the influence that went out was powerful for good. The convention commended especially the banishing of spirits from the army, the formation of a temperance society in Congress, the increase in the number of temperance groceries, public-houses, and steamboats; and the influence of woman in the reform. (“In the temperance and anti-slavery agitations woman first emerged from the privacy

of home life to sign public petitions and mount the platform.”—Schouler.) The convention recommended: a temperance society in every town and city ward in the United States; a temperance publication in every family in the land; that editors publish information on the subject of temperance, and thus prove themselves benefactors of mankind; that statistics be gathered in every locality of the progress of temperance, and of the relation between pauperism, and crime, and strong drink; that on the last Tuesday in February, 1834, simultaneous temperance meetings be held throughout the world. It was also voted to form a more organic and representative national temperance organization, to be composed of the officers of the American Temperance Society and of the several State societies, to take the place of the American Temperance Society. This was not carried into effect, however, until three years later. Through the liberality of Stephen Van Rensselaer, of Albany, 100,000 copies were distributed of the proceedings of this convention.

Second Period: 1836-1851. Teetotalism.

The second National Temperance Convention met in Saratoga, August 4, 1836, with three hundred and sixty-four delegates in attendance. The scope of the temperance reform was now to be enlarged and the bounds set out, where, on the purely moral side, they have ever since remained.

Since the last National Convention a branch agency of the American Temperance Society had been established at Philadelphia, with Rev. John Marsh, former agent of the Connecticut State Society, as its incumbent. By vote of Congress, and approval of President Jackson, the sale of spirits to the Indians had been prohibited in 1834. The first temperance almanac had been issued in Albany. The report of Samuel Chipman had been given to the public, containing the results of his investigations, on an exhaustive scale, in the jails and poorhouses in the State of New York upon the relation between intemperance, pauperism, and crime. The marine insurance companies in New York City had voted to deduct five per cent from premiums on ships sailing without spirits (of which there were already many hundreds),

which was followed, a few years later, by a similar offer from the Cincinnati companies, of a reduction of ten per cent on temperance steamboats.

It was now ten years since the American Temperance Society had begun its work, and ushered in the era of entire abstinence as the effectual remedy for intemperance. That principle had now had a fair trial, and the verdict was that it had worked well—as far as it had been tried. The principle was sound, but its application had not covered every contingency. Entire abstinence meant the renouncing of ardent spirits—the distilled or spirituous liquors, like whisky and rum; nothing more. Ardent spirits alone had been aimed at by the temperance movement—first their regulation, or moderate use; then their renunciation, until now. Latterly, however it was found that many who had stood on their feet, members of temperance societies, had again fallen, not on rum, but on wine, cider, and beer. From the days of Dr. Rush it had been generally considered that fermented liquors, in ordinary quantities, did not contain sufficient spirit to produce intoxication. Dr. Rush did not in fact recommend these drinks

as a substitute for spirits, but recommended, instead, simply water. Persons who were "unable to relish this simple beverage of nature," he allowed, *might*, "in preference to ardent spirits," drink cider, wines, malt liquors, molasses and water, or vinegar and water, the juice of the sugar maple, and coffee.

It was not unknown, indeed, for men to abstain from wine, and from malt liquors even, comparatively early in the reform. But this was not emphasized or widely recognized, and was not embodied in the organized movement. The subject now compelled attention, and upon closer examination it was found that, not in distillation, but in the process of fermentation itself, the intoxicating principle in liquor was produced. A story is told of a New England innkeeper, who, having previously been addicted to ardent spirits, was induced to join a temperance society. He was constantly in the habit of recounting the blessings of the temperance reform upon himself, yet he was notoriously oftener drunk than before, being scarcely ever sober enough to see his own inconsistency. One morning when, as usual, he was

much the worse for hard cider, a Quaker stopped with a wagon at his door. Trying in vain to adjust some part of the Quaker's harness, he at length apologized that his eyes were very sore. He did n't know what was the matter with them, he said.

"Do you suppose," he asked, "that these goggles are any help to my eyes?" revealing, as he removed them, an extraordinary pair of fiery balls surrounded by ulcerated, hairless lids.

"Nay, friend," replied the Quaker.

"Do tell me," rejoined the innkeeper, "do n't you know something or other that will help my eyes?"

"Yea, verily," replied the Quaker, as he jogged his horse forward, "thee mayest wash thy eyes with the cider, and put the goggles over thy mouth."

But there was another practical difficulty. Not merely did men who abstained from spirits lapse on cider, wine, and beer; but it was often hard to get men to take even the ardent spirit pledge while these other liquors were not given up. "If I could afford to use wine as you do,"

some poor rum drinker was apt to reply, "I would be willing to give up my grog." (A poor man could buy far more stimulation in rum in those days, before the taxing, than he could in wine.) "You want to take away our drink, but you keep yours." So it was coming to pass that all intoxicating drinks would have to stand or fall together.

The principle of abstinence, having once been established, it was less hard to extend it to all liquors that produced intoxication. The new plan had already been introduced in the societies at Hector and the neighboring towns in New York, between 1826 and 1830, chiefly through the influence of Rev. Joel Jewell. As secretary of the Hector society, in 1827, Mr. Jewell is believed to be the first to have brought into use the word *tee-totalism*. There were two classes of members in the society: those who abstained from ardent spirits only, before whose names on the roll the letters *O. P.*—old pledge—were placed; and those who took the more comprehensive pledge, including, in addition, wine, before whose name the letter *T* was placed, meaning total. By explaining this

designation on the roll, that *T* stood for total, such persons were directly called *T-Totalers*.

The pioneer in total abstinence across the water was the society at Preston, in Lancashire, England. Joseph Livesey, a Preston provision dealer, of large good sense and self-education, who as a poor orphan boy had worked in the cotton mills of that town, seeing that the pledge against ardent spirits alone was insufficient, drew up a pledge of total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors on August 23, 1832, signed it, called in a neighbor, John King, who was passing, to sign with him; then secured five other names. These were the "seven men of Preston," who became the founders of the total abstinence movement in England. But Livesey was the father of the cause, and became its chief promoter. This was called the "tee-total pledge," a designation not imported from America, we are told, but from the speech of a laboring man, "Dickey" Turner, who at a meeting of the Preston Society, in September, 1833, in referring to the current half-way pledge (from spirits only), said he wanted nothing of that, but that he 'd be out-and-out, "right down t-total for-

ever," repeating the first letter for emphasis. Those present at once said that that was the word; the pledge should be called *teetotal*.

But however the name may have passed into currency, teetotalism was becoming a fact. The Mississippi State Temperance Convention, on Christmas, 1833, recommended that all new societies abstain from wine as well as from spirits. The Kentucky Legislative Temperance Society, organized early in 1834, with the governor as its president, voted to abstain from both spirits and wine. In 1835 the New York State Temperance Society—the most efficient perhaps of all the State societies—began to advocate through its official paper, *The Temperance Recorder*, total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors. This position was also taken, in the fall of the same year, by the Massachusetts State Society at its convention in Boston. After some correspondence with the leading men in the reform, Dr. Justin Edwards, the corresponding secretary of the American Temperance Society, who had already pointed out the necessity for this advance step, sent out a call for a second national temperance convention, as has

been mentioned, to meet in Saratoga, New York, in August, 1836.

At this convention the principle of abstinence was extended to all intoxicating liquors. The new pledge was generally adopted by State and local societies, though there were not wanting those who refused to go to that extent. The new temperance organization, contemplated at the National Convention three years before, in Philadelphia, was now put into operation under the name of the American Temperance Union. General John Hartwell Cocke, of Virginia, an early stanch friend of the cause, whom the management of a large estate and the command of troops had convinced of the value of temperance, became its first president. Now that the American Temperance Society was merged into the new organization, Rev. Justin Edwards resigned as corresponding secretary. The five annual reports, beginning with 1831, which he had prepared, dealt not merely with the events of the temperance movement, but were packed with cogent discussions of the underlying principles of the reform. Each annual report was widely circulated and eagerly

read, beyond the seas even, and everywhere compelled attention. Among the abundant and effective literature of this period these reports must be given a foremost place. They were now republished in a single volume, under the title, "Permanent Documents of the American Temperance Society;" and the active work of Justin Edwards was done. Rev. John Marsh, a tried and efficient worker in the cause, was made corresponding secretary of the American Temperance Union, a position he held for twenty-nine years, during the entire life of that body; until, under changed conditions, it was reorganized upon a new basis, and with a new name.

During this fruitful third decade the American temperance movement had not only introduced the reform abroad, as we have seen, through its literature, but it materially furthered the cause through its personal representatives there. Rev. Nathaniel Hewit, upon resigning the general agency of the American Temperance Society at the close of 1830, was the first to go abroad in the interests of the movement. He visited Great Britain and France. The most important service,

perhaps, was rendered by Rev. Robert Baird, a poor Pennsylvania boy, who by dint of ambition and hard work graduated from Jefferson College and from Princeton Seminary, and was now the agent in an American movement for the evangelization of Southern Europe, particularly France. In connection with this mission, during the latter half of the thirties, he made several tours through Northern Europe in the interests of temperance. He went before crowned heads, presenting them with copies of his "History of the Temperance Societies in the United States," and reporting personally of the good workings of these societies. King Frederick William III of Prussia, who a few years before had commissioned his minister at Washington to make him an accurate report of the temperance societies in America, gave Baird a warm welcome; ordered his history to be translated into German, and a copy sent to all the clergy, with the injunction to the minister of police to encourage in every locality the formation of temperance societies against spirits. Another representative abroad was Edward C. Delavan, who went in 1838, taking with him a large supply

of temperance literature. Delavan was an early retired merchant of Albany, of wealth and culture, who since the close of the twenties had given his gratuitous service to the temperance cause, and had become the master spirit of the movement in New York State. Through his liberality and enterprise millions of temperance publications were circulated. He defrayed the expense of Rev. Nathaniel Hewit's European tour in 1831, already mentioned; took a prominent part in the agitation against fermented liquors, and at the organization of the American Temperance Union in 1836 he was made chairman of the Executive Committee, donating ten thousand dollars to the Union for its work.

With the going out of the thirties the interest in the reform had apparently suffered a decline. This was due partly to the more comprehensive and drastic form of the pledge, resulting in an unfruitful controversy, within the Church, over the question of Bible wines, due partly to the resort to legislative expedients, but due most largely, probably, to the fact that no sweep of moral enthusiasm can continue unabated for many years

at a time. This brief abatement was followed, however, by a renewed wave of interest and enthusiasm that was to rise to a height such as had never yet been reached. It was the Washingtonian movement.

For the first time now was the temperance reformation to assume the title rôle of actual redemption. Its aim and work hitherto had been prevention, and its sphere the moderate drinker. Let him entirely renounce the use of strong drink, it was argued, and the prolific spring of drunkenness will be dried up; and when the present generation of drunkards, for whom there can be but little hope, has gone to the inevitable grave, the nation will be sober. In consequence the temperance movement was confined almost entirely within the limits of Church and of respectability. The new manifestation was to break forth outside these bounds, and addressing itself to the outcast victims of drink, was destined to accomplish, under the impulse of an almost irresistible moral enthusiasm and by the power of moral appeal, what had hitherto been considered impossible even to religion—the reclamation of the drunkard.

It began in Baltimore, in 1840. On a certain evening the first week in April, a small company of men—congenial spirits—had gathered, as was their custom, at Chase's Tavern on Liberty Street, to spend the evening over their cups. Rev. Matthew Hale Smith, the temperance lecturer, was to speak in the city that night. It was agreed that several of the company should go to hear the lecture, and report. When they came back one remarked that he believed temperance was all right. The tavern-keeper, who was standing by, said those temperance people were all hypocrites. "It's all well enough for you to say that," the other replied; "it's to your interest to cry them down." The matter was talked over. Some one suggested that Mitchell (a tailor) draw up a pledge. After another meeting or two a pledge was drawn up, covering all intoxicating liquors, and was signed by six men. They called themselves, The Washingtonian Temperance Society, in honor of the father of his country. Their first meetings were held nightly, in a carpenter shop; then weekly. At once they commenced to gather in recruits. It was a rule for every member to bring a man with him. By

fall their society had several hundred members, reformed drinkers. The most valuable accession, who joined the society in June, was John Henry W. Hawkins, destined to become the leader of the movement, "the major-general of the total abstinence army," as his comrades called him.

Hawkins was born of Christian parents, and at fourteen had professed religion. But being apprenticed to a hatter he drank with the other boys; formed a taste for liquor, and became a confirmed drunkard. When, after he had married, he was carried home drunk, and his family would care for him so tenderly, it pierced his heart with compunction. After several trials he resolved once more, on June 12th, that with the help of God he would never again taste nor expose himself to the temptation of strong drink. Three days later he signed the pledge, and kept it. Early in 1841, Hawkins, with four others, went to New York City to tell the story of their reformation. Daily meetings were held in the largest Churches, and finally in the park. From here they went to Boston, where Faneuil Hall would not hold the crowds. In groups these men went from city to

city, and State to State, as far west as St. Louis, securing signatures to the pledge by the thousands, and starting Washington Societies. A newspaper was established as the special organ of the movement, and Martha Washington Societies, among women, sprang into existence. Not the drunkard only, but all classes gave their names to the pledge, to countenance the work. By 1843, however, interest began to wane, and soon Washingtonianism had spent its force. Hawkins, though, continued his labors unremittingly in the cause of temperance until his death, in 1858, visiting every State in the Union save only California.

In the light of subsequent history it is of interest to note what was the attitude toward this reform, of that most typical and best loved American, Abraham Lincoln. By invitation from the Washington Society in Springfield, Illinois, Lincoln delivered a Washington Birthday address in the Presbyterian Church of that city, on February 22, 1842, in the course of which he said: "Whether or not the world would be vastly benefited by a total and final banishment from it of all intoxicating drinks, seems to me not now an open question.

Three-fourths of mankind confess the affirmative with their tongues; and, I believe, all the rest acknowledge it in their hearts. . . . If the relative grandeur of revolutions shall be estimated by the great amount of human misery they alleviate and the small amount they inflict, then, indeed, will this be the grandest the world shall ever have seen. . . . And when the victory shall be complete, when there shall be neither a slave nor a drunkard on earth, how proud the title of that land which may truly claim to be the birthplace and the cradle of both those revolutions that shall have ended in that victory!" Lincoln entered zealously into the temperance reform, having made speeches and written on the subject when yet a young man. By his unswerving fidelity to the principle of total abstinence through the years of his later public life, he became a pillar of strength to the temperance cause—a service less widely understood to-day or appreciated, because of his larger labors in Negro emancipation. In 1862 he signed the bill banishing grog from the navy, as thirty years before it had been banished from the army. The influence of Lincoln's mother, who

died when he was but nine, was never effaced. Three things she had impressed upon him: never to tell a falsehood; nor use profanity; nor taste liquor.

In the wake of the Washingtonian crusade followed a new manifestation—the secret fraternal temperance orders. They sprang up in response to new needs. The drunkards, who by the thousands had been swept out upon dry land by this wave of unparalleled moral fury, needed care. They must be gathered up, and by sympathy and encouragement nurtured to health and strength. Outcasts from society, they needed the sense of brotherhood and to be restored to respectability. With no money, they needed financial aid in case of sickness or death. And none of the existing beneficiary fraternal orders rested on total abstinence.

The first such secret temperance organization in America was the Independent Order of Rechabites (for whose name see Jeremiah xxxv), the first “tent” of which was established in Boston in 1841. It received its name and form from a similar order in England, established at Salford in 1835. Up

to the time of the Civil War this order had a good growth. Lately its prosperity has revived somewhat.

A more important order in preserving the fruits of the Washingtonian movement was the Order of the Sons of Temperance, organized in New York City on September 29, 1842, in Teetotaler's Hall, 71 Division Street. This order, like the preceding one, was beneficiary. It grew rapidly, reaching the zenith of its prosperity at the close of the first decade of its existence, with nearly a quarter of a million members. This order was introduced into Great Britain in 1847, and has since spread widely to other countries. Since 1866 women have been admitted to full membership.

The Cadets of Temperance, offspring of the Sons of Temperance, and composed of youth, attained an independent existence between the years 1845-47, at the time when Bands of Hope sprang up in England. Cold Water Armies had already been in existence in this country for some years. In 1859, Rev. John Marsh, the corresponding secretary of the American Temperance Union, had

started a paper, *The Youth's Temperance Banner*, in which "the doings of the juveniles were first brought to light."

In 1845, the Templars of Honor and Temperance, offspring likewise of the Sons of Temperance, came into being. Organized by the members of the latter order, and intended at first only as a higher degree in that order—for more educational work and a study of methods of active propagandism—it separated from its parent in 1846, and soon spread over the country and into Canada. As the temple succeeded the tabernacle in the wilderness, not to be taken down or folded up, so the name of this order was to be a symbol of its permanence. In 1878, an endowment plan, with sick and death benefits, was adopted.

What proved to become the largest of all the fraternal temperance orders originated in Central New York, in 1851—the Order of Good Templars. During this year a lodge at Utica and at Oriskany Falls, belonging to an ephemeral temperance organization with fantastic rites, called the Knights of Jericho, resolved to form a new organization, with a new ritual. They called themselves "Good

Templars," to sustain their recognition as an individual body. About a dozen lodges were thus organized in Oneida County, when in July, 1852, at a convention of these lodges in Utica, the newly-organized lodge at Syracuse withdrew, through a grievance of its leader, Levrett E. Coon, and resolved itself into an "Independent" Order of Good Templars, changing its motto to Faith, Hope, and Charity. Some of the other lodges joined in this—practically all of them later; and thus constituted, this organization was to become the fruitful parent of a multitude. The order grew rapidly. In 1855, at a meeting of the Grand Lodges of ten States, in Cleveland, the Right Worthy Grand Lodge was organized as the supreme head of the order. In 1874, Hon. Samuel D. Hastings, for a number of years the head of the order, was sent to Australia and the islands of the Pacific in the interests of temperance. Since then it has extended over all the earth. In 1876, at Louisville, Kentucky, the Grand Lodges of Great Britain and Ireland seceded, ostensibly over the question of extending the order to the Negroes. In 1887, through the persevering labors of John B. Finch,

for three years the head of the order, this breach was healed. Through the agency of this temperance organization many hundred thousands of men, women, and youth have taken a life pledge of total abstinence. The order is not beneficiary.

The Washingtonian movement, though of brief duration, served to give a new impulse to the growth of temperance sentiment. In 1842, the Congressional Temperance Society was re-organized, with over eighty members, upon a basis of total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors. Hon. George N. Briggs, of Massachusetts, later for a number of years the governor of that State, a man zealous in behalf of temperance, and one of the finest types of manhood produced by this State of many grand men—became the president of this society. In January of the same year both houses of the Pennsylvania Legislature, at Harrisburg, adjourned to attend, with the governor and the heads of State departments, the session of the State Temperance Convention held in that city. The following year the Corporation of New York City voted to provide no intoxicating liquors at the banquet and reception to be given to the

President of the United States in June; and no wine was provided at the massive Bunker Hill celebration in Boston, the same month. No wine was served at the festivities attending the inauguration of Edward Everett as President of Harvard College, in 1846. Reuben H. Walworth, Chancellor of the State of New York, had become president of the American Temperance Union in 1845, succeeding General J. H. Cocke. Dr. Thomas Sewall, of Washington, at about this time also, had prepared his plates of the human stomach, showing that organ in all stages from health to death by delirium tremens. Through the liberality and personal labors of Mr. E. C. Delavan, these were hung as charts in schools, prisons, and public institutions of various kinds. Temperance lecturers made use of them, moving men oftentimes to conviction where argument alone failed.

On August 4, 1846, the first World's Temperance Convention met in London, in the Covent Garden Theater, for a five days' session. This event marked the grandest demonstration in favor of the temperance cause that had yet been witnessed in England. Among the thirty-two Amer-

ican representatives present were Lyman Beecher, E. N. Kirk, John Marsh, William Lloyd Garrison, Elihu Burritt, and Frederick Douglass.

One of the most effective men on the platform during the Washingtonian decade was Dr. Charles Jewett. Relinquishing a lucrative medical practice in 1838, and with a scientific mastery of the subject of strong drink, he addressed himself chiefly to the thinking portion of the community. His lectures were, however, popular in form, and were spiced with piquant illustrations. Jewett's keen, flashing eye would kindle any audience, and with a vein of humor unsurpassed he made the hour pass rapidly, and made his second appearance more welcome everywhere than his first. Many a temperance speaker of that day filled his cruse at the sparkling spring of Jewett's logic and wit. In 1849 he published his lectures, poems, and other writings on temperance. Of equally keen wit, incessant and most fearless advocate of temperance, was that hunchback Wyoming Valley Presbyterian preacher, with a heart as generous as his wit was unsparing—Rev. Thomas P. Hunt, or "Uncle Tommy" Hunt, as he was familiarly

called. It was he who had been chiefly instrumental in enlisting Dr. Charles Jewett actively in the reform. General Ashbel Riley, of Rochester, was another powerful lecturer in those days, traveling extensively over this country and in Europe. Captain Benjamin Joy, of Ludlowville, New York, was another indomitable pioneer in the temperance reform, who for forty-five years gave his time and his strength, without remuneration, to the cause. After Rev. Joel Jewell, of Hector, he was one of the first to organize a teetotal society at Ludlowville. It was at a prayer-meeting in his home, in 1843, that a young Princeton student decided to enter the ministry, a man still young at eighty, whose eloquent voice and facile pen have for more than half a century been employed with unflinching courage in the mighty battle against strong drink; namely, Theodore L. Cuyler.

Two names yet remain—among all the apostles of temperance the most famous. As at the seventh anniversary of the American Temperance Union in New York City in 1843, the Hutchinson family of singers from New Hampshire were introduced to the larger world and to fame, so at the

eighth anniversary, in 1844, in the same city, John B. Gough was introduced to the world. A native of England, but since the age of twelve an American; a bookbinder by trade, first in New York City, then in various cities in New England; his father and mother—godly parents—some years dead, and recently also his wife and child, from hunger and neglect; John B. Gough, now at twenty-five a hopeless drunkard and wreck, was invited by one Joel Stratton, a Quaker, on the streets of Worcester, Massachusetts, to attend a temperance meeting—in October, 1842. He signs the pledge; he tells the story of his reformation in the rural districts of Worcester County, after the manner of a Washingtonian; he succumbs again to his old habit, but only to confess his weakness in open meeting, and sign again. Marrying again in 1843, and determined now to devote his life to rescuing drunkards, he starts out through New England lecturing, until he reaches Boston, where he forms the friendship of Deacon Moses Grant. It is this patron of temperance who introduces Gough at the anniversary in New York City. Gough's gifts are at once recognized, and John

Marsh, the corresponding secretary of the American Temperance Union, engages him for a tour through New York State. His fame is established! A natural-born orator, of unsurpassed dramatic powers, he could move an audience to laughter or to tears. From that day to the day of his death, in 1886, he was the most brilliant and famous speaker on the temperance platform, and one of the most popular lecturers America has ever had. Three times he visited England in the interests of the reform.

On July 2, 1849, Father Theobald Mathew, the great Irish apostle of temperance, landed in New York City. His American tour may be said to close, with fitting climax, another era in the great temperance reformation. A humble friar, ministering in a mission chapel in Cork, Father Mathew's reception in America was such as the proudest monarchs of earth might envy. His only title to distinction lay in his labors on behalf of temperance. A million persons and more had taken the pledge of total abstinence at his hands in Ireland and Great Britain. Father Mathew had taken up the cause of temperance through the

influence of one William Martin, a Quaker, on the governing board of the Cork Workhouse, with Mathew, where the sad results of drink were especially manifest. Having sent for Martin to assist him in forming a temperance society, Father Mathew calls a public meeting on the evening of April 10, 1838, and is the first to affix his name to the pledge. In three months twenty-five thousand had signed, and Mathew belonged to the public from now on.

Father Mathew's welcome to New York City was one that is seldom accorded a foreigner. Welcomed officially by addresses from the Board of Aldermen, the mayor, and the heads of the different temperance organizations in the land, the procession from Castle Garden to the City Hall was a truly triumphal entry. He received a similar official, enthusiastic welcome in Brooklyn, Boston, Philadelphia, and other cities. He was banqueted by President Taylor at the White House; honored by the United States Senate with admission to the bar of the Senate chamber, a distinction shown previously to but one foreigner—General Lafayette. Among the eulogies pronounced on this

occasion by several distinguished senators was one by Henry Clay, who said: "It is but a merited tribute of respect to a man who has achieved a great social revolution—a revolution in which no blood has been shed, a revolution which has involved no desolation, which has caused no bitter tears of widows and orphans to flow; a revolution which has been achieved without violence, and a greater one, perhaps, than has ever been accomplished by any benefactor of mankind."

Father Mathew visited twenty-five States, administered the pledge, under growing ill-health, to some six hundred thousand persons, many of them—perhaps most of them—his own co-religionists, whom other agencies had not, or could not, have reached. On November 8, 1851, he gave his farewell address to the people of the United States, and returned to his native land, soon to rest from his labors.

And as the century had just entered its third quarter, so the reform was now also passing over into a third phase.

(III.)

CHAPTER III.

CULMINATION: PROHIBITION. 1851-1856.

THAT the principle of moderation is inadequate and impracticable as a remedy for intemperance; that the total abandonment as a beverage, not of ardent spirits only, but of the fermented liquors as well (being in no sense necessary in health),--- is the only wise ground and sure remedy: this had become the accepted opinion and ever-deepening conviction at the time of which we write. On this basis an incipient reform had grown into a reformation, a social revolution espoused by men foremost in mind and morals, and by all the best interests in society. A propagandism directed with signal ability, and sustained with singular enthusiasm, had led men by the hundred thousands in all walks of life to resolve that they would put away the drunkard's cup forever.

But this had not all proven clear gain. The

ranks of the drunkard were being recruited, not alone from the moderate drinkers, but from those who had taken the pledge as well. They meant to keep the pledge, but fell before the power of a returning appetite. How many went down again no one knows. Perhaps not far from one-half. When the pledge covered only spirituous liquors the trouble was readily enough seen, and the pledge was extended. But yet it did not avail. With the safeguard and support of a pledge of total abstinence from all intoxicants, men still lapsed into their former habits. Of the half million that were helped to their feet temporarily by the Washingtonian crusade, it was estimated that two-thirds again fell; this notwithstanding the fact that the temperance orders, introduced at this time, aimed specifically to prevent such lapse. Men thought at first that teetotalism was a solution of all former difficulties, and would prove to be the agency of redemption. In 1843 a huge demonstration had been given Father Mathew in Cork, for Ireland was considered redeemed. The consumption of strong drink had been reduced by over one-half. But Father Mathew went on a tour to England,

and the consumption of liquor increased again. The potato famine of 1845-47 increased it still more; and when Father Mathew returned from America, sick and exhausted, he found the fruits of his labors gradually slipping away.

Attention had been concentrated on the drinker and drunkard. To him men had appealed, first to drink only moderately; then not to drink at all. Looking about now in perplexity, eyes fell on that other man—on him who hands out the liquor that makes men drunk. Here was discovered the source of trouble. Here was the man who incited afresh the smothered flames of thirst which men were struggling to quench. That men should drink was his business, his living. Through every avenue he distributed his goods—at the grocery, where people buy; at the tavern, where they eat and lodge; at the grogshop, where men find sociability; at the various times and occasions that bring people together—everywhere men were brought face to face with strong drink and temptation. And no man can resist temptation beyond a certain point; he must be kept from entering in.

That making a livelihood out of a business

which thus tempts and destroys men is but poor employment, had been recognized and urged, indeed, early in the reform. Large numbers had in consequence entirely abandoned that occupation; but their places were generally only again taken by others less scrupulous. From this position, that men ought to quit such business, conviction moved by an inevitable transition to this other position; namely, this business, being the great remaining obstacle to the success of the temperance reformation, should and must cease.

But how? Very naturally, go to the dram-seller with moral appeal to desist selling, as men had gone to the drinker to desist drinking. If the one had yielded to such appeal, why should not the other? It was the attempt to put this belief into practice that ushered in a new era—the third—in the reform.

Up in Portland, Maine, there was a man in business, of Quaker parents, and scarcely over thirty, who had already in various ways showed that he possessed both a firm conviction and a resolute courage in the matter of temperance. His name was Neal Dow. He had just secured an offi-

cial position for a friend, a Harvard graduate and a man of fine ability, admirably qualified for the place, but whose tenure of it was conditioned on his keeping strictly sober. An attractive and very respectable liquor shop in the vicinity was his chief pitfall, his pride still keeping him from the lower resorts. Appealed to by his wife, and believing that the refusal of this man to furnish him liquor would help him in his resolve to abstain, and perhaps save him and his family from impending ruin, Dow called on the liquor-seller and laid the peculiar circumstances of the case before him.

The man listened respectfully, and Dow believed he was making a fine impression, until, when he had finished, the man replied to this effect: "Mr. Dow, you attend to your business, and I will look after my own. My business is to sell liquor; I have paid my money for this privilege. That money helps to pay your taxes, and it's small business for a man to come around here trying to prevent me from doing what business I can, and have a right to under the law. If this man comes in here in a sober condition and asks for liquor, I have a right to sell it to him, and shall do so. And

I do n't want you to come around whining about it, either." Stung to the quick with disappointment and indignation, Neal Dow said that he would see to it that sooner or later he and all like him were driven from the community, unless they abandoned their infamous business. The very license, as it hung in plain sight behind the bar, seemed itself to shout in exultation, "The State of Maine gives him this right!"

The temperance reform hitherto had encountered only human appetite. This, though persistent enough, had yet yielded largely to moral appeal. Now the reform was to encounter a more cruel and unconquerable foe; namely, human avarice. But Dow's promise to the liquor-seller proved to be no idle threat. The words had burned themselves deeply into his soul. It was his business to sell liquor, the man had said; he had paid for that privilege. He had a "right" to sell, consequently. Yes, so his license stated. His license! A license then means, not restriction or regulation, but permission—for money. Shame! for a people, for such a bribe, to allow that a man may do evil. But the power to grant this privilege involves the

power, also, to withhold it! And Neal Dow solemnly vows before God that he will carry his appeal to the people of the State of Maine, who have given this man such right, that they shall take away from him that right, and outlaw from the State this business which thus impoverishes and destroys her citizens.

He canvasses the State from one end to the other, giving addresses, holding mass-meetings, scattering broadcast temperance literature. Neal Dow becomes the storm-center of the new agitation. The arguments, taken from facts near at hand, are irresistible. Maine, rich in natural resources, yet poor. The products of her two principal industries, lumbering and the fisheries, exported chiefly to the West Indies, receiving in return rum and molasses; consuming the rum, and converting the molasses into rum and consuming that also. This in addition to the native product, for Maine was still overrun with breweries and distilleries. So that the vast wealth of the forests and fisheries went down the throats of the people in the form of strong drink, and with all their labor they were left only the poorer. Signs of wretchedness and pov-

erty abounded everywhere. Farms carelessly tilled; fences tumbled down; neglect about the house—gates unhinged, blinds coming off, window panes broken, with an old hat or garment put in the place to keep out the cold.

But persistent seed-sowing at length yielded its harvest. After an unsuccessful law in 1846 (which lacked the means for its own enforcement), came the absolutely prohibitory law of 1851, in effect July 4th (Independence-day!), the first-fruits of prohibition from the ripened fields of temperance reform. No citizen of Maine shall henceforth be permitted, for a money consideration, to put a block of stumbling in his brother's way; or to rob those who are weak, because he is willing to share his booty with the State. The liquor business is outlawed. Neal Dow, as mayor of Portland, the framer and champion of this measure, becomes the father of the "Maine Law"—the model for all similar laws that were to follow.

Let us pause here to note more in detail the successive stages by which we have come thus far:

First. The sale of strong drink, being recognized as fraught with abuse and evil, was sought

to be properly restricted with various regulations, according to no definite plan or principle, but as expediency seemed to suggest from time to time. Accordingly, from earliest colonial days we have such regulations as these: fixing the price of beer and ale at one penny, then at two pence; punishing drunkenness—now the drunkard only, now the keeper of the public house also; forbidding drinking to one's health—permitting it again; laying a duty—taking it off again; forbidding the sale on certain hours of the Sabbath, now for the entire day; limiting the number of retailers to a town—removing such limit; making debts for liquor unrecoverable; making it unlawful to sell on credit beyond ten shillings—to sell on credit at all; posting a list of habitual tipplers in every public-house; taxing the distiller and brewer; licensing the vendor of spirituous liquors—of vinous and malt liquors also; making the license fee small, now larger; allowing the sale of larger quantities without license; requiring a license for every sale, etc.; and, lastly, requiring of the liquor-seller a bond for the proper observance of these regulations.

Second. The traffic in strong drink is not so

much merely disposed to evil, and therefore to be regulated; it is itself evil, and should therefore be abandoned. It is in violation of the law of God, which leads not into temptation, and works no ill to his neighbor.

In the fifth report of the American Temperance Society, in 1832, Justin Edwards set forth this truth with great power and conclusiveness. This report went to all parts of the world. It passed through several editions, and was reprinted in England. Chancellor Reuben H. Walworth, of New York State, wrote: "It is of the utmost importance to the temporal and eternal interests of our citizens that a stop should be put to the sale of ardent spirits as speedily as possible. . . . Satisfy the unreflecting vender of ardent spirits that he is morally responsible for all the crime and misery which his maddening potations naturally produce, and he will relinquish the demoralizing traffic." The Churches of New England at this time voted not to admit to membership any who refused to give up this business.

Third. If the traffic in strong drink is itself evil, and wrong, so that no man should engage in

it, then the law that permits this traffic is wrong, and should be repealed.

The sixth report of the American Temperance Society, in 1833, by Justin Edwards, devoted itself to the clear demonstration of this truth. This report, too, was widely read, and its position commended by such men as, Presidents Francis Wayland, Heman Humphrey, and Wilbur Fisk; by Hon. Mark Doolittle, Gerrit Smith, Edward C. Delavan, Theodore Frelinghuysen, and Chief Justice David Daggett, of Connecticut.

The step here was simply for the repeal of all license laws, which were recognized to be essentially permissive. As Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen, the distinguished senator from New Jersey, said: "If men will engage in this destructive traffic; if they will stoop to degrade their reason and reap the wages of iniquity, let them no longer have the *Law Book* as a pillow." Hon. John Cotton Smith, ex-Governor of Connecticut, wrote: "I am decidedly of the opinion that all laws for licensing and regulating the sale of ardent spirits ought to be instantly repealed—1. Because, if intended as a source of revenue, they are manifestly immoral;

2. If considered as sumptuary laws, which by their operation are designed to restrain the sale and consumption of that article, they are wholly inefficient." What benefit such repeal would work is set forth by Judge Jonas Platt of the New York State Supreme Bench, distinguished alike as jurist and philanthropist, in an address before the Clinton County Temperance Society, on February 26, 1833 (the day of simultaneous temperance mass-meetings throughout the country); namely: "By fair construction, such license and tax legalize the traffic, and a plausible excuse is afforded to those who now pay a premium for such legislative sanction. The law is an impediment to the Temperance Reformation. Let reason have free action and fair play, and we ask nothing more. Public opinion would be brought to bear with much greater force against the practice of retailing this poison if dramshops were left unlicensed and unsanctioned by any statute regulations whatever. Whenever public opinion and the moral sense of our community shall be so far corrected and matured as to regard them in this true light, and when the public safety shall be thought to require it, dramshops

will be indictable at common law *as public nuisances.*" That is what in fact had been done a year or two before in the city of Washington. Upon the opinion of Hon. William Wirt, Attorney-General of the United States, that they had this power if the public good required it, the Board of Health of that city had pronounced the sale of ardent spirits a public nuisance, and ordered it discontinued for the space of ninety days.

Beginning at about this time, licenses were refused in a number of towns and counties in Massachusetts and elsewhere, and in many of these ardent spirits ceased to be sold. Petitions were presented to State Legislatures during the thirties, asking that all license laws be repealed. Neal Dow writes of this period, many years afterwards in his Autobiography: "The question whether licenses should be granted, however, was a practical one only from a moral and educational point of view. Liquor-selling was by no means confined to licensed dealers. Everybody sold who cared to sell. Only the 'good' citizens who desired to deal in it took the trouble to obtain the legal permission to do so. Restrictive clauses of the law were gener-

ally disregarded by the licensed sellers, while the prohibitive features had no restraining effect upon those who could not, or did not trouble themselves to, obtain licenses. The authorities, as a rule, made no attempt to enforce the law against either class of violators. Nevertheless, we believed it would be of immense value in its moral effect and educational influence if the regularly elected representatives of the people should officially declare against giving the sanction of law to the iniquitous trade; hence the action of the friends of temperance."

Fourth. Since the traffic in strong drink is evil, and morally wrong, not only should the public sanction of it, in the form of license, be withheld; but the continued sale should be prohibited by law.

Judge Platt, in his address already referred to, had said that they asked for no coercive legislation, but only the repeal of permissive laws. Justin Edwards, in his report of the American Temperance Society, already mentioned, had taken the same position, yet had confessed that if, after such legal sanction had been taken away, and the power of public sentiment and moral appeal had

done its perfect work, men still persist in the traffic, then the State might step in and take such measures in self-defense as it deemed adequate. Gerrit Smith, of Peterboro, New York,—he portly in appearance, princely in manners and munificence, the embodiment of benignity and grace; in the very forefront of the twin reform movements—abolition and temperance, and later member of Congress,—Gerrit Smith, as early as 1833, at the annual meeting of the American Temperance Society in New York City, in May, had introduced a resolution calling for the abolition of the traffic in ardent spirits by law. He argued that public opinion was far in advance of the laws; that the law be brought up to the level of public opinion, lest public opinion fall back to the level of the laws. “Could a society that should require its members to abstain from purchasing lottery tickets be expected to preserve silence on the subject of lottery offices?” (Lotteries were just beginning to be abolished by law.) “No more can a society, formed to dissuade men from drinking spirits, look with indifference on the attractions and snares of the rum shop.”

That this step should be taken was inevitable. In the course of a few years a system of local option came into effect quite generally. Towns and counties did not only withhold license, but made it a punishable offense to sell without a license. Thus in 1842 there was but one county in Massachusetts where the sale of spirituous liquors was licensed, and for several years there was not a single licensed house for the sale of spirits in Boston. The result of all this was a move by the liquor men—precisely what temperance men had advocated a few years before—to sweep away all license and restrictive laws as unconstitutional, claiming the right to sell without a license or express permission. Suits which involved this principle were carried from New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, to the United States Supreme Court in 1845, on appeal by the liquor men. Although they had both Webster and Choate to argue their case, the verdict was against them. On March 6, 1847, before an anxious public, the Supreme Court handed down its decision—the first one arising out of the temperance movement.

Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, in his opinion,

said: "Every State may regulate its own internal traffic according to its own judgment, and upon its own views of the interest and well-being of its citizens. I am not aware that these principles have ever been questioned. If any State deems the retail and internal traffic in ardent spirits injurious to its citizens, and calculated to produce illness, vice, and debauchery, I see nothing in the Constitution of the United States to prevent it from regulating and restraining the traffic, or from prohibiting it altogether if it thinks proper."

Justice Catron: "I admit, as inevitable, that if the State has the power of restraint by license to any extent, she has the discretionary power to judge of its limits, and to go to the length of prohibiting sales altogether if such be her policy; and that if the court can not interfere in the case before us, neither can we interfere in the extreme case of entire exclusion."

Justice Grier: "It is not necessary to array the appalling statistics of misery, pauperism, and crime which have their origin in the use or abuse of ardent spirits. The police power, which is exclusively in the States, is alone competent to the correction of these great evils, and all measures of

restraint and prohibition necessary to effect the purpose are within the scope of that authority. All laws for the restraint or punishment of crime, for the preservation of the public peace, health and morals, are, from their very nature, of primary importance, and lie at the foundation of social existence. They are for the protection of life and liberty, and necessarily compel all laws of secondary importance which relate only to property, convenience, or luxury, to recede when they come into contact or collision."

Justice Woodbury: "After articles have come within the territorial limits of States, whether on land or water" (Webster had argued that the right to import implies the right to sell) "the destruction itself of that which constitutes disease and death, and the longer continuance of such articles within their limits, or the terms and conditions of their continuance, when conflicting with their legitimate police, or with their power over internal commerce, or with their right of taxation over all persons and property within their jurisdiction, seems to me one of the first principles of State sovereignty and indispensable to public safety."

With this decision the way was clear for a further and final advance; namely:

Fifth. The complete prohibition, by the State, of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes.

Dr. Lyman Beecher, in his famous Six Sermons, had already suggested the necessity for general prohibitory legislation. Among the first clearly to state this principle and publicly to champion it was General James Appleton, a veteran of the War of 1812, a man of high character, of great ability and influence, and of unflinching moral courage. A member of the Maine Legislature from Portland, he was made chairman of a special committee, appointed by that body in 1837, to take into consideration the entire subject of the license system of the State. Some alteration in the license laws was widely called for. The report of this committee, prepared by General Appleton, after calling attention to the numerous changes that had been made from time to time in license laws ever since such laws were first passed by Massachusetts in 1646, pointed out that the difficulty lay not in the form of the law, or in the mere manner of

granting the license—circumstances of but little moment,—but in the principle of the law itself. “They authorize the sale of ardent spirits for common use; this is the principle that gives them character,” he writes. To these laws is attributed the wide prevalence of intemperance. “They make it lawful and reputable for a person who has a license to sell it, and of course not improper nor dishonorable to purchase and use it.” As a remedy the report suggests: “When it is seen that the traffic in any article entails not only pauperism and crime upon the community, but that in numerous cases it threatens human life, and in many instances destroys it at once, it is difficult of escaping the conclusion that the government should interfere and prohibit it altogether. . . . It is sufficiently difficult to reform the manners and habits of the community when the influence and authority of the law can be brought to aid the object, but to do this against the law and against the direct and powerful interests of a numerous class of men created by law is scarcely possible. . . . The mere existence of such a (prohibitory) law would exert the most salutary influence upon the public mind.

It would of itself go far to create public opinion in regard to the necessity of ardent spirits, for it is no more true that the laws are an expression of public opinion than that they influence public opinion. They are as surely the cause as the effect of the popular will."

This report was widely read throughout the State, and did much to mold sentiment. From this time onward the subject was constantly kept before the Legislature and the people, through the instrumentality chiefly of the Maine Temperance Union, which included in its membership many of the foremost citizens of the State, until in 1845 a Legislative body had been elected pledged to total abstinence and favorable to prohibition. The result was the first prohibitory law, in 1846, passed by a vote of 81 to 42 in the House, and of 23 to 5 in the Senate, and signed by Governor Anderson. After several unsuccessful efforts, later, to pass measures remedying the practical defects in the law, a new bill was brought before the Legislature, which, after being thoroughly discussed in two sessions, was passed by a two-thirds vote of both houses, and on June 2d was signed by Governor Hubbard, going into effect July 4th—the law of

1851. With this event the era of prohibition begins.

Other States were not slow to follow. Maine had proved herself true to her motto as the *Dirigo* State—"I direct." Sentiment had been slowly maturing elsewhere. In a number of States a majority of the towns had already for several years declared against license. They were now ready to adopt the Maine law.

1852. In March the Territory of *Minnesota*, by popular vote, ratifies the adoption of Maine Law. The courts, however, declared "that the submission of this question to the people for a popular vote had been unconstitutional;" and prohibition is in operation but for a short time. *Rhode Island*, in May, adopted a similar law, strengthening it by subsequent enactments. *Massachusetts*, in the same month, followed with a Maine Law. The section relating to search was declared unconstitutional, the law otherwise standing. Its place was taken by the more elaborate law of 1855. *Vermont*, in December, closed the year with a Maine Law, a law that was to stand uninterrupted for over half a century.

During this same year—1852—the Sons of Temperance also declared for prohibition.

1853. By act of the Legislature, a Maine Law was submitted to the people of *Michigan* for a vote, who declared for it by a majority of twenty thousand. The court was equally divided on the constitutionality of the submission clause. The law remained, but its enforcement was practically suspended. It was superseded by the more perfect law of 1855.

On September 6th, the second World's Temperance Convention met in New York City, with delegates from every State, from Canada, and from Great Britain. Neal Dow was elected president of the Convention, a testimony to his service in the cause of prohibition. The Maine Law formed the chief topic of discussion during the sessions.

The cause had already found friends in other lands. In England, on June 1st of this same year—1853—the United Kingdom Alliance had been organized for “the total and immediate legislative suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors as beverages.” The initiative in this movement was taken by Mr. Nathaniel Card, of Man-

chester, a member of the Society of Friends, in consultation with the leading temperance men of England. Sir W. C. Trevelyan, Bt., was made president of the Alliance. In the Canadian Parliament, this same year, prohibition was defeated by but four votes.

1854. In June, *Connecticut*, by a vote of 148 to 61 in the House, and of 19 to 2 in the Senate, adopts a prohibitory law.

In March of the same year the Legislature of New York, by a vote of almost two to one, had enacted a prohibitory law; but Governor Horatio Seymour, notwithstanding this vote and the expressed will of the people, vetoed the measure, claiming that it was oppressive and in certain features unconstitutional, and that, in general, entire prohibition would be injurious rather than beneficial to the temperance cause. That this veto would be accepted as a finality by the people on this question was not to be expected. Their mind had been made up. As Horace Greeley, who did yeoman service in the reform, said in the *Tribune*: "What the temperance men demand is not the regulation of the liquor traffic, but its destruction,

not that its evils be circumscribed (idle fancy!) or veiled, but that they be, to the extent of the State's ability, uttered eradicated."

1855. In April the Legislature of *New York* for a second time passes a prohibitory law. Horatio Seymour is no longer in the governor's chair to veto this measure; but in his stead the people have elected Myron H. Clarke, who had been the able champion in the State Senate of the measure that perished the year before in Governor Seymour's hands. The new governor promptly signs the bill, and prohibition goes into effect on July 4th of this year. On this day ten thousand people assemble on the magnificent estate of the Earl of Harrington, at Derby, England, in honor of the event. An English and an American oak are planted side by side, and a granite block is erected with appropriate inscription to commemorate an event "so important to the world." But the fruits of victory were soon to perish. The law was forced into the labyrinth of Justice, and in so doing left hope behind. The Court of Appeals, by a vote of five to three, in March, 1856, pronounces the law unconstitutional. The grounds of the majority decision were severely attacked by some of the most

eminent jurists in the land; the contention of the court being that the law made no distinction between liquor on hand at the time, and what might be later acquired; holding the confiscation of the former to be in violation of that portion of the Constitution which declares that "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law" Hon. Henry Dutton, Kent Professor of Law in Yale, and governor of Connecticut, in a review of this decision, said that if the depreciation of the value of an article renders a law unconstitutional, "then the statute-books of the United States and of the State of New York are full of unconstitutional laws."

Having been thus twice balked in her fervent zeal to reform, the Empire State in angry and sore despair gave herself over to evil entirely—to this day.

In June, 1855, the Legislature of *New Hampshire*, by a large vote, passed a prohibitory law, applying to the sale only, not to the manufacture, a law that was to remain in force for near half a century. All New England was now under prohibition.

During this year also—1855—the first Territorial Legislature of *Nebraska* enacted a prohibitory law. *Delaware* enacted a similar law. *Indiana*, after a vigorous State campaign the preceding year that resulted in the election of a temperance Legislature, likewise adopts prohibition. Portions of the law were declared unconstitutional by a majority decision of the court; as to the validity of the entire law the court was evenly divided.

In addition to these, Iowa enacted a prohibitory law in 1855, which was made to apply to spirituous liquors only, a law that remained in force until complete prohibition in 1884. In Wisconsin prohibition had been declared for by the people; enacted by the Legislature, and failed of becoming a law only by the veto of the governor, in 1855. Michigan, Ohio, and Illinois had abolished all license laws, the first two making it permanent by embodying it in their Constitution. In Pennsylvania a prohibitory measure passed the Assembly, but was defeated by but one vote in the Senate. In New Jersey a similar bill was lost only by a tie vote. In addition to these achievements, large portions of other States were under

no-license, through the operation of local option laws.

Such was the sweep and momentum which the temperance movement had now attained. After all these years of labor and sacrifice, in which men had felt every inch of the way; had found, fought, and won every successful issue, the great reform seemed to be nearing a consummation. John Marsh, the corresponding secretary—and soul—of the American Temperance Union since its organization, and more closely in touch with the entire movement than any other man, wrote in 1855: “Not a State has retracted from the high stand it has taken; while in other States the leaven of reform is powerfully working. Indiana and Illinois are ready for prohibition. Nor will Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and Texas be slow to follow. The North will give up, and the South keep not back; and men in other countries are already hailing and welcoming this as one of those great moral revolutions which occur, under God, in the course of ages, to root out sin and sorrow, and usher in millennial glories.” A kind of expectancy prevailed the air. The priest grown

gray in the temple service of the reform was looking with eager gaze to see with his own eyes, before he should go hence, the salvation of God.

At this point, with the Presidential election of 1856, the temperance reformation was suddenly arrested in its progress. A cloud the size of a man's hand was appearing upon the horizon. It drew attention away from every other object.

The anti-slavery agitation had been contemporaneous from the beginning with the movement for temperance reform. The men active in the one had also, generally, been advocates of the other. "When there shall be neither a slave nor a drunkard on earth"—the language of Lincoln—was the vision which these men saw in the night. The passion for freedom and righteousness not unnaturally embraced both forms of this dual bondage. Conviction in the one was not less profound, nor the enthusiasm less intense, than in the other. The principles of the temperance reformation had, in fact, penetrated more widely, and had won a more general recognition than those of Abolitionism. Two characteristics, however, were peculiar to the slavery reform, which gave it at once a seeming

predominance, and brought it at last to a speedy, violent issue. In the first place, slavery was a constitutional question. All agitation was focused at the Nation's Capital, and the question was dyed as with blood into the very warp and fiber of our national political life. This accounts for its greater publicity, and also—in part at least—for the fact that the historian, while relating the events of this struggle with great minuteness of detail, does not even so much as make mention of the other. The historiographer is slow to extend his demesne beyond the pageant of kings and armies and forensic jousts. In the second place, slavery was a sectional question. It was this which brought the speedy settlement at last. The Nation was compelled to grapple with it for its very life.

At first, for a number of years, the two sections of the country were pretty evenly divided and balanced. Then the free States began a slow ascendancy in population, wealth, and power. The census of 1820 revealed this growing disparity, with a considerable majority for the North in the House of Representatives. The slave States had looked on with apprehension, and now began in earnest

their struggle to maintain an equilibrium in the Senate. To this end the South must have more slave States. Upon her success in this the maintenance of her very life depended. For this purpose she looked to the Territories. This, together with the ever-growing determination of the North to resist these aggressions, furnishes the key to the history of the United States for the next forty years. The Missouri Compromise of 1820 was the beginning of the open struggle. Missouri as a slave State was made to offset Maine, admitted at the same time as a free State. Shut out from the North by this compromise, the slave States looked to the Southwest; aided in wresting Texas from Mexico in 1836, and by the election of Polk in 1844 secured its admission to the Union as a slave State. Arkansas had in the meantime been admitted to offset Michigan in 1836, and in 1845 Florida to offset Iowa. To add to the slave territory, an effort had been made, under Polk, to purchase the island of Cuba by an offer of \$100,000,000; but failing in that, adventurers tried filibustering, to capture and compel her to come in. California was admitted in 1850 as a free State, but only after a debate of ten months and another

compromise and the enactment of the fugitive slave law.

The free States now had a clear majority, and if they acted together might pass such legislation as they chose, voting slavery out of any Territory. To forestall this, the fatal Kansas-Nebraska Bill was brought forward in 1854, with its doctrine of popular or squatter sovereignty. Congress has no power to vote slavery, either *in* or *out* of the Territories, so it was now said. The people of the Territories must decide that for themselves. These two Territories (Kansas and Nebraska) were to be organized on that basis, the plan being to settle Kansas from the slave State of Missouri, then settle Nebraska from Kansas, and win both for slavery. The passage of this measure aroused and unified the anti-slavery sentiment of the North, and raised up a new political party committed against the further extension of slavery. The large vote, two years later only, in the Presidential election of 1856, for John C. Fremont, the candidate of this party, came as a tremendous surprise, especially to the South. It was an ill omen for the peace of the Union.

The heat of the controversy had been intense; the long day was well wearing on; the heavens became ominous with approaching disaster. Men read it *Secession—Disunion*, and read aright. Every other thought was crowded out of men's minds. Apprehension grew rife, and with ample cause, for only too soon it came—the Dred Scott decision, the Kansas struggle, Harper's Ferry, another Presidential election—and the first bolt rent the house in twain: the heavens broke in a tempest of blood and desolation.

It was Civil War!

B. COMPLICATION.

The Internal Revenue Tax, July 1, 1862. Taxation.

(I.)

CHAPTER IV.

ITS MEANING FOR THE GOVERNMENT.

THAT it would prove no holiday affair to suppress the uprising of the South soon became evident. The Nation was thrust into the awful throes of a life-and-death struggle. With the call to arms came also the call for the sinews of war. The Nation must have money, and more money.

After the inadequate revenue measure passed the year before, the Internal Revenue Act, creating a Bureau of Internal Revenue, was passed and approved July 1, 1862. It has been the policy of our Government to resort to an excise tax only as an expedient in circumstances of extreme urgency. Only twice before had such direct internal tax been laid—the first time just after the close of the Revolutionary War, and removed again under Jefferson in 1802; the other time during the War of 1812, and removed soon after its close, upon recommendation by President Monroe, in 1817. But

these measures were as nothing compared with that of 1862. By this law, which went into effect September 1st of that year, nearly every visible thing or transaction was made to yield revenue. Among these were tobacco and liquors. In addition to the tax upon liquor, there was a special license tax upon liquor dealers of all kinds—brewers, distillers, rectifiers; wholesalers and retailers of spirituous, malt, and vinous liquors (except domestic wines free).

A tax of twenty cents a gallon was laid on spirits, which was raised to two dollars by the close of 1864, and reduced again gradually, and fixed at ninety cents a gallon in 1875. Here it remained until the Spanish-American War, since which time it has been \$1.10 a gallon. Malt liquors, under the Internal Revenue Act, were taxed one dollar a barrel. This was reduced temporarily to sixty cents in 1863, but was restored the next year, and fixed at one dollar. In addition to this, there was the special license tax upon the liquor-maker and liquor-dealer himself, varying in amount from twenty to two hundred dollars a year, according to the amount and kind of business done. This

act, by laying a heavy tax upon the liquor industry and requiring a license fee from its chief promoters, was to add greatly, in a quite unforeseen way, to the complexity and persistency of the drink question. The Nation gave to the drink business—a business all but outlawed when the war began—official recognition and sanction, and entered into a peculiarly close relationship with it.

And yet the evil consequences likely to flow from this act were not wholly unforeseen, and this portion of the bill was not allowed to pass without a vigorous protest. Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, later Vice-President of the United States, who but a few months before had introduced the bill emancipating the slaves in the District of Columbia, in moving to strike out the particular clause licensing the liquor business, said: “My reason for making this motion is that I do not think any man in this country should have a license from the Federal Government to sell intoxicating liquors. I look upon the liquor-trade as grossly immoral, causing more evil than anything else in this country, and I think the Federal Government ought not to derive a revenue from the

retail of intoxicating drinks. I think if this section remains in the bill it will have a most demoralizing influence upon the country, for it will lift into a kind of respectability the retail trade in liquors. The man who has paid the Federal Government twenty dollars for a license to retail ardent spirits will feel that he is acting under the authority of the Federal Government, and any regulation, State or municipal, interfering with him, are mere temporary and local arrangements that should yield to the authority of the Federal Government. . . . Every senator knows that this Nation has been and is being demoralized by the rum traffic. Every man knows that our army of five or six hundred thousand in the field has been greatly demoralized by the sale and use of rum. . . . Since this war opened we have lost thousands of lives by rum. Sir, with this Nation suffering as it is suffering by the sale of ardent spirits, the Congress of the United States proposes to give its sanction to the traffic. I would as soon give my sanction to the traffic of the slave-trade as I would to the sale of liquors. . . . I tell you, sir, there is not a rumseller or a friend of the

rum-seller on this continent that will not welcome this tax. Why, sir, it has been the struggle of the retailers of rum all over this country for a quarter of a century to adopt the license system and to get licensed. They have contended for it; they have fought for it; they have carried it to the polls; they have carried it into your legislative assemblies; they have carried it everywhere; and now the Congress of the United States proposes to establish the system rejected by many of the States as sanctioning crime, and to grant it to them."

Senator Samuel C. Pomeroy, of Kansas, during the second day's debate on this particular clause, registered an equally strong protest. "Sir, I know that the friends of temperance throughout the country have everywhere labored against the license system. Ten years ago the senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Wilson) and I were members of the Legislature of that State, and every rum-seller of Boston clamored for a license. That was their religion, their god. If they could get a license it was all they wanted. They deprecated nothing so much as being deprived of a license. Why? A license gives a kind of sanction to the

business, makes the traffic, which in that community as in almost every other is disreputable, popular."

1. A tax, or specifically the Internal Revenue tax on liquor, means, first, *permission*.

To receive money from individuals or a class does not always or necessarily, of course, imply an indorsement of their craft or profession. The Government levies a sum of money upon that class of persons, for instance, known as the highwayman, the counterfeiter, the embezzler, the bribe-giver, the wife-beater, the incendiary. It puts this money into its pocket without compunction. But it calls this levy a fine, not a tax. It exacts it as a penalty, not as the price of a privilege. It is not license (permission), but punishment. The levy is not made as light as possible, and collected at regular stated times and receipted for; but as heavy as possible, and whenever and as often as such person can be caught in his peculiar occupation and convicted. The aim is not to raise revenue, but to discourage and suppress such business as subversive of morals and of good government.

Entirely different is it when a Government

raises money, in the form of taxes and license fees, for its legitimate and necessary expenditures. It derives this support from the legitimate industries of the people. Its aim and interest are not to suppress, but to promote. The tax is not made more burdensome than the particular industry can well bear, and is fixed both as regards time of payment and the amount. And when such tax is regularly paid each trade will enjoy immunity from interference or restriction. It is to the interest of the Government that it should prosper. In an address at Columbus, in 1882, John Sherman pointed out the practical identity of a tax and a license—Ohio having since 1851 constitutionally soothed her conscience by “taxing” the liquor business, but not “licensing” it. “A tax on a trade or occupation implies a permission to follow that trade or occupation. We do not tax a crime. We prohibit and punish it. We do not share in the profits of a larceny; but by a tax we do share in the profits of liquor-selling, and therefore allow or license it.”

2. A tax implies, secondly, *protection*.

When a trade or business is taxed for the support of the Government, it follows that such trade

is entitled to the benefits of government, one of whose very first functions is that of protection. In levying and receiving a tax the Government makes a pledge of service. The former as a right is inseparably linked with the latter as a duty. That Government which, after collecting taxes from one class of its citizens, would refuse to give them the fullest protection in their business, would be as deficient in morals as a tyrant who makes no pretense of being bound by considerations of right, or a villain who goes squarely back on his assured promises and decamps as soon as the money is in his possession. Every taxed or properly taxable business or enterprise, the Government must, by every principle of justice and in very self-consistency, extend to it protection from molestation and guard it in its right to exist and prosper.

With respect to the liquor-trade the United States Government has not been consistently true to this principle. When it collects a tax from the liquor-seller it protects him from molestation only so far as its own punitive machinery is concerned. Beyond this it leaves him to the tender mercies of local caprice and the vengeance of the State. Thus

when a man engages (with proper precaution) in the sale of liquor in a prohibition State or a no-license town, while he will suffer no interference from the Government, if he has paid the Federal tax and holds a Federal permit, neither has he any redress at the hands of the Government if the local authorities pounce upon him, confiscate his stock of liquors and cast him into prison.

We have this anomalous condition, then, that a constable or village official may destroy one of the legitimate, taxable industries of a community, an industry upon which the Nation depends largely for its revenue; and may throw a man into prison for engaging in a business which the Government said was a proper business and one he might engage in. There is a fault somewhere in the logic of this policy. It is not so known elsewhere. In the division of governmental functions between Federal, State, county, township, municipal, and village authority in all other things there is no such conflict of power or jurisdiction. Each is supreme in its sphere. It would seem as if the Government should do one of two things: (1) If it claims the right to tax the liquor-traffic it should exercise

toward that traffic the power of complete protection, denying to the States the right to vex or prohibit; or (2), If the Government yields to the States the exclusive right to regulate the liquor-traffic, it should keep its own hands off, and withdraw from the business the prestige and support of Federal sanction. But who is sufficient for these things?

However, the principle of protection, though somewhat confused in its application, is still true even here; for let the liquor-seller pay his Federal tax and hang up his Federal permit, and pay his State or local license fee and frame and hang up his "Licensed to sell," and no power on earth dare molest him. Though a man's brain be set on fire by the liquor he sells, and he in turn go home and fire his house, or his neighbor's, or kill his friend in a brawl, or his wife or children, though the cause may be clearly traced to the liquor that he drank, yet the man who gave him that liquor not only escapes punishment, but is protected in his right to sell more. If any crank or zealot should enter that saloon to smash, because it is a source of evil and crime, he would receive but short shrift.

Because, therefore, the liquor-trade pays special revenue and license taxes to the State and Nation, it receives their protection to carry on this trade: which is just and right.

3. A tax, or specifically the Internal Revenue tax on liquor, involves, thirdly, *partnership*.

To give sanction and protection to any business, and to share proportionally in its profits, is to become, in a sense, a party to that business. Above any other industry in the land is this true of the liquor-trade, with reference both to the extent to which the Nation shares in the profits of this trade, and the peculiarly elaborate and painstaking methods which the Nation employs to ascertain and collect its share of these profits. Taking these in turn:

(1) Extent.—For the year—or rather ten months—ending June 30, 1863, the first year the Internal Revenue law was in effect, the Government received from the liquor-trade seven million dollars out of a total internal revenue that year of forty-one millions from all sources, or about 17 per cent. That percentage was at once increased by the increase in the tax on spirits. When

the war was over the other industries were one by one relieved of their special taxes, except only the liquor industry (and tobacco), in whose profits the Government shared in ever-increasing proportion. Thus during the decade of the seventies 50 per cent on the average of all internal revenue was derived from the liquor-trade. In the next decade it rose to 70 per cent on an annual average; while during the year ending June 30, 1897, the last year before the special Spanish War tax went into effect, 78 per cent of all internal revenue taxes laid by our Government came from the traffic in strong drink. Or taking the entire receipts of the United States Government, from all sources, for the year ending June 30, 1900, for instance, including the Internal Revenue tax (\$295,327,927), customs revenue on imports (\$233,164,871), postal service (\$102,354,579), and all miscellaneous items, such as profits on coinage, bullion deposits and assays, consular and patent fees, sale of public and Indian lands, tax on national banks, etc. (\$38,748,054), the total receipts aggregated \$669,595,431, of which sum \$185,183,657 (Internal Revenue tax on liquors, \$177,137,992; duties on

wines and liquors imported, \$8,045,655), or 27.6 per cent was received from the trade in strong drink.

Thus for a Government to share so largely in the profits of the liquor-trade as to derive more than one-fourth of its entire income from that source, means that it stands in closer relationship with this particular one, than with any other of its industries.

(2) Method. — The Government shows an eagerness to secure its share of the profits of the liquor-trade unknown in the case of any other business or industry.

The entire Internal Revenue Department has for years had scarcely anything to do other than to watch the ledger of the liquor business. The commissioner of internal revenue at Washington, receiving a salary equal to that of the treasurer of the United States; the chief clerk, deputy commissioner, solicitor; the more than threescore collectors assigned to the different districts in the Union; the nearly one thousand deputy collectors; clerks, surveyors, gaugers, and storekeepers assigned to the distilleries in the different localities—

all are kept busy looking after the trade, now inspecting plans and buildings, now measuring and gauging the liquor in vats, now tending the warehouse ("keeping store") and waiting on the proprietor when he wants his goods, now—and chiefly—going over accounts and figuring profits.

Each brewer and distiller must make a monthly report. Books must be kept open for inspection by the Government agent. Every manufacturer of stills must give notice of each still made, and the name of the person who is to use it. If a distillery is to be built a minute plan must be submitted to the commissioner and collector, who may make any change they see fit. The Government agent has the keys to the distillery, and may enter any time of the day or night. The receiving cistern is under his lock and key, and by his permission alone can spirits be withdrawn. When the products of the distillery have been placed in the warehouse in bond, the Government furnishes a storekeeper; and when the liquor is withdrawn, to enter upon its mission in society, this storekeeper is on hand to collect the Nation's share on each gallon and barrel, and to paste on each cask

and flask, as it goes out, the Federal trade-mark, the sovereign people's "O. K." This is not meant as a guarantee that the stuff is good for man to drink, but means simply that the tax has been paid, and therefore it may flow unmolested.

The liquor interests have not failed to make use of this intimacy of the United States Government with their business. In a full-page advertisement of a certain brand of whisky recently in several of the foremost publications of the country we have this assuring announcement in large headlines, "Uncle Sam says it's all right." After which follows this information: "Uncle Sam, in the person of Ten of his Government Officials, has charge of every department of our distillery. During the entire process of distillation, after the whisky is stored in barrels in our warehouses, during the seven years it remains there, from the very grain we buy to the whisky you get, Uncle Sam is constantly on the watch to see that everything is all right." The zeal of our great Government is faithfully depicted here. It must not be supposed, however, that the object of this zeal is the well-being of the public. Uncle Sam is not after purity and

peace and good citizenship, but after money. It is when he receives this that he finds his voice and says, "It's all right."

This trade, therefore, that filches millions each year from the pockets of the people, and gives them nothing in return—no bread for either body or soul, no clothes, no comforts; but instead, contention and sorrow, want and woe—our Government has become a jealous partner in this business, and has given to it the influence of its great name, because the business is willing generously to share with it its easily and ill-gotten gain.

4. A tax, or specifically the Internal Revenue tax on liquor, involves, lastly, *promotion*.

The sphere of government is not merely the passive function of collecting revenue and shielding its citizens in the enjoyment of their rights—taxation and protection. It must assist in promoting the welfare of its people by stimulating their industries, facilitating their commerce, and extending their markets. This is what any good government constantly aims to do. By patents, for instance, it seeks to encourage invention; by copyrights, to stimulate literature and art; through its

consular service, to learn the condition and needs of the foreign market, with a view to facilitating export trade and the expansion of its own industries.

This is the one thing a government has constantly in mind when it levies its taxes. It is this which makes the question of taxation, seemingly simple, so intricate and difficult a problem. The Government needs money. It levies a tax rate upon the country's wealth-producing industries. But how and where shall the tax be laid? Shall it be a direct tax upon persons, or incomes, or capital, or land? Or an indirect tax upon articles of consumption? Shall the tax be laid upon the necessities of life, or upon its luxuries? Shall each pay according to the benefits he enjoys from the Government, or according to his ability to pay? Shall equality of taxation mean equality of sacrifice, or equality in the amount actually paid?

The statesman who sets himself to work out a tax budget for his people will find these questions anything but trifling. Let him have a care lest in taxing thrift and enterprise and economy, a premium be put upon idleness and improvidence;

or in taxing necessities, the burden be put upon those who consume most and are least able to pay; or in taxing forms of wealth easily concealed, those inclined to be dishonest make false returns and escape their just proportion of taxes, while those who are truthful pay more than their share. And above all, there must be no discrimination, as in the tariff rates or special privileges, in favor of any one industry as against another. The reason for the frequent change of financial policy in the United States is that the people have believed these very inequalities and discriminations to exist. The pledged purpose of our Government is to "promote the general welfare," which is to be accomplished by promoting impartially all its legitimate individual industries.

The one industry that concerns us here is the drink trade. In taxing this trade, has our Nation been true to this principle of just government, or has the drink trade suffered retrogression because of unjustly high taxes and harsh restrictions? Whatever our Government may or may not have done, it has compiled statistics which show that the liquor industry, from the time the Internal

Revenue tax went into effect, has enjoyed continuous and increasing prosperity in every respect— (a), as to the amount of capital invested; (b), as to the quantity of liquor produced; (c), as to the value of the product.

(a)

CAPITAL INVESTED IN THE MANUFACTURE OF LIQUOR
IN THE UNITED STATES.

(From the United States census bulletin.)

CENSUS	SPIRITS	MALT LIQUORS	WINES
1850	\$5,409,334	\$4,072,380	\$.....
1860	12,445,675	15,782,342	306,300
1870	15,545,116	48,779,435	2,334,394
1880	24,247,595	91,208,224	2,581,910
1890	31,006,178	232,471,290	5,792,783
1900	32,551,604	415,284,468	9,838,015

(b)

PRODUCTION OF LIQUOR IN THE UNITED STATES SINCE
THE INTERNAL REVENUE ACT.

(Average annual, by decades.)

YEAR ENDING JUNE 30	GALLONS	
	SPIRITS	MALT LIQUORS
1863-1870	37,000,000	152,000,000
1870-1880	60,000,000	308,000,000
1880-1890	75,000,000	646,000,000
1890-1900	83,000,000	1,079,000,000

The figures here given are not for the separate years of the census, as in the preceding schedule,

but represent an average annual for the ten years of each decade. The production of spirits fluctuates so greatly from year to year that the figures for any one year would not give a correct idea of the real ratio of increase. In the production of malt liquors, however, there has been no such fluctuation, the growth of that industry having been regular, and, as may be observed, rapid. Both as regards the amount of capital invested, and the product put out, this latter industry has about doubled itself every ten years. Again, the statistics in the United States reports for any one year represent in reality neither the production of liquors for that year, nor the consumption, but the quantity that has been withdrawn from warehouses, under government supervision, for purposes of consumption, and upon which the tax has been paid. Yet in the long run the quantity produced each year will about equal the quantity consumed; so that the average annual figures for a period of ten years, as given in the schedule, will represent, with a fair degree of accuracy, the consumption of liquor for that year.

Wines are not included in this schedule. The

wine industry does not figure prominently in government reports; is not usually given at all. It pays no tax, except a customs duty upon wines imported.

Taking now the average annual consumption per capita for our entire population, of all kinds of liquor, during the last three decades, we have these figures:

AVERAGE ANNUAL	WINES	GALLONS SPIRITS	MALT LIQUORS
1870-1880	.55	1.40	6.91
1880-1890	.48	1.34	11.19
1890-1900	.38	1.25	15.47

Whatever else these figures may show, they demonstrate that taxation has not affected the liquor industry adversely. The slight decrease in the per capita consumption of spirits can not be justly laid to taxation, for malt liquors are heavily taxed, and they have more than doubled on our rapidly increasing population; while wines, which are not taxed at all, show a larger percentage of decrease than spirits. The causes for this must be looked for elsewhere.

(c)

VALUE OF THE LIQUOR PRODUCTS OF THE UNITED STATES.

(From the U. S. Census Bulletin.)

CENSUS	SPIRITS	MALT LIQUORS	WINES
1850	\$15,770,240	\$5,728,568	
1860	30,936,585	21,310,933	\$400,791
1870	36,191,133	55,706,643	2,225,238
1880	41,063,663	101,058,385	2,169,193
1890	104,197,869	182,731,622	2,846,148
1900	96,798,443	237,269,713	6,547,310

But all this is as yet only negative proof of our proposition that a tax, or specifically, the internal revenue tax on liquor, involves promotion. These statistics show merely that under the policy of taxation the liquor business has been promoted. That this has been done primarily by those engaged in the trade, whose financial interests are bound up with that trade, is, of course, to be assumed. But we want to know what hand, if any, the Federal Government has also had in it.

That the Government should have had a part in facilitating and fostering the growth of the liquor trade is what we would expect, to begin with. This not in a general way merely (the liquor trade being one of the nation's legitimate indus-

tries), but in a special way and for a special reason, for has not the Government a special financial interest in this particular branch of its industries? Does not more than one-fourth of its entire support come out of it? The feathered creature that can lay such golden eggs, and lay them regularly, and without pain, apparently, deserves some special care. No other legitimate industry in the country can yield such revenue and prosper. And to find a good and legitimate trade that can do this—and we must believe that the trade in strong drink is a good business, or the Government would not get its living off it—wise statesmanship will see to it that special care be given to promote it.

And this has been done. It is only the policy of taxation consistently carried out. Its logic can not be questioned, therefore.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue is the point of contact between the nation and the liquor trade. Through this bureau repeated expressions of friendship and solicitude have been conveyed to the trade. Through this bureau the Government has been officially represented at a number of the gatherings of liquor men. At the fifth United

States Brewers' Congress, held in Baltimore, in 1865, Internal Revenue Commissioner Wells was present and said: "It is the desire of the Government to be thoroughly informed of the requirements of the trade, and I will give information on all questions, in order to bring about a cordial understanding between the Government and the trade." Subsequent events show that such cordial understanding has been both brought about and maintained during these many years.

At the eleventh Brewers' Congress, held in Pittsburg, in 1871, the president of that body said that he hailed it as an encouraging sign that the Government was being represented at their meetings. Mr. Louis Schade, of the Internal Revenue Bureau, was present to address the convention and to report their proceedings. At the Brewers' Congress the next year, in New York, the Internal Revenue Bureau had two representatives present, who assured the convention that "the brewing industry is receiving attention in the office of Internal Revenue that it has never received before." Two representatives were likewise present at Cleveland, in 1873. When the Brewers' Congress

met in Milwaukee, in 1877, the commissioner of internal revenue stated the situation exactly when he wrote to the convention: "I am glad to learn that the conduct of this bureau has been satisfactory to such an important body of tax-payers as the brewers of the United States, and I trust that nothing will occur to disturb the friendly relations now existing between this office and your association." The next year, in Baltimore, the same commissioner was present in person. At the Brewers' Congress in Washington, in 1890, the head of the Internal Revenue Bureau was again present. "Our business relations for the last year," he said in addressing the convention, "have been quite extensive, and I may say—speaking for the officers of the Commission of Internal Revenue—that they have been of a pleasant character. In order that they may continue so, and that the pleasant feature of the connection may as far as possible be increased, it is very desirable that the commissioner should know you all personally, and that, personally, he should know your wishes. . . . You are all business men engaged in a lawful business, and entitled to pursue that business untram-

meled by any regulation of the office of the commissioner of internal revenue, except in so far as may be necessary for the purpose of collecting the revenue."

To the principle expressed in this address the Government has been consistently true. It imposes no regulations whatever upon the liquor business except as they relate to the "collecting of the revenue." In no prohibition State or no-license town, where people have said that they did not want the business, does the Government lend its influence to suppress it. In fact, the Government encourages the business.

In some remote town, for instance, the fathers and mothers have determined that their sons and daughters shall be brought up free from the influence of the saloon; that the community shall be peaceable and orderly, and a good place to live in. After a hard struggle and much sacrifice they have carried the day, and liquor-selling in that place must now cease. The community is bent on exercising in this particular its full privilege of home rule.

The officials proceed to carry out the wish of

the people, and enforce the law. They are succeeding—or seem to be—reasonably well. Some saloons have bowed to the inevitable and closed entirely; others have taken to the dark. The saloon business is severely crippled and would die, if only the strong arm of federal law would but come to the assistance at this point and administer the stroke of mercy. Will the Government do it? The liquor business is in sore straits. It is outlawed, and has no standing in the community. The federal permit, too, has run out now. Will the Federal Government, the only remaining partner in the business, now help to enforce the law to the extent at least of withholding from the outlawed business a renewal of its permit? Alas! our great and good Government, since the days of the taxing, has lost the power of moral discernment as touching the things that pertain to the drink traffic. It can scarcely discern between its right hand and its left. It mutters but one word—*Revenue*.

The saloon-keeper is aware of this fact, in this particular village. He is afraid of the local authorities, but he is more afraid of the United States authorities, to sell without their sanction, for these

have a swift and drastic way of dealing with any who may be found selling without a permit. So the man applies to the collector of revenue for his district, for a permit to sell liquor. The Government does not refuse—it never refuses. It may be said of our Government in this respect, as was said upon the tombstone of a certain saloon-keeper, “He had a pleasant smile for everybody.” The man in this case pays his twenty-five dollars, gets his receipt, and the Government promises to keep its hands off.

With but one source of danger now to watch, the saloonkeeper is willing to take his chances. He begins to sell, in the dark, of course. Drunkards are now seen occasionally on the street again; it becomes a matter of common talk that liquor is being sold. There may be an occasional conviction, but that is hard to get, and unpleasant and expensive for those who prosecute. But even a fine will not stop the selling; there is such profit in liquor, he can afford to pay. The amount sold will be magnified by those opposed to the law, and disaffection will spread. At the next election the temperance people will probably have hard work to

carry no-license again; or if they do succeed, it is likely to be by a narrow margin, only to be beaten the year following. Liquor had been sold anyway, people had argued. There had been drunkenness and disorder, constant contention and strife, and the town got no revenue; this carried the day for license. This is the actual history of a majority of the towns in the United States that have ever tried to put no-license into operation.

Of the several factors that enter into the situation we wish here to point out only one, this, namely: If the United States Government had not, in defiance of the local law, entered into connivance with the saloon-keepers and given them encouragement, by promise of immunity, those saloon-keepers would not have dared to sell liquor. Consequently, next to the man who stands behind the bar, the United States Government stands as the chief promoter of this entire business.

The Government practices this same code of ethics in every State, district, municipality, and town that is under prohibition. Any one wishing to sell the contraband article need but to apply to the Internal Revenue office, inclosing always

the twenty-five dollars, and he will receive the Government's written sanction by return mail, and no questions will be asked. And while the local officers of the law are trying to find out the lawbreakers, the agent that acts for the United States could name them by name.

Then every twelvemonth all these receipts are duly set down in the official report of the commissioner of internal revenue, as among the nation's assets. It will be recorded, for instance, that in Kansas, where the citizens are struggling to keep the decivilizing drug out, there were during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, one rectifier, 2,756 retail liquor dealers, eighteen wholesale liquor dealers, three brewers, 308 retail dealers in malt liquors. Which means simply that from this number the Government received money, and in turn issued permits. Some of these may have sold only a small fraction of the year, and then been thrown into prison, or otherwise driven out of their business by the vigilance of State or local officers. But the Government puts them all down as so many persons doing a full liquor business; furnishing material in so doing, for those who are constantly disparaging the labors of temperance and order.

These things the United States Government does through its legislative and executive arms, while over against this stands the solemn declaration of its highest judicial tribunal, to this effect: "By the general concurrence of opinion of every civilized and Christian community, there are few sources of crime and misery to society equal to the dramshop, where intoxicating liquors, in small quantities, to be drunk at the time, are sold indiscriminately to all parties applying. The statistics of every State show a greater amount of crime and misery attributable to the use of ardent spirits obtained at these retail liquor saloons than to any other source. To retail intoxicating liquors is not an inherent right in a citizen of the United States or of a State; and any State, in the exercise of its police power, may prohibit the traffic therein entirely."

Verily, while the voice sounds like Jacob's, the hands are unmistakably the hands of Esau!

Not only in the promotion of its trade at home has the liquor business received aid from the Federal Government; it has received aid from the same source in the promotion of trade abroad. It

was but a few years ago that the Secretary of State at Washington sent a note to our consuls in the Central and South American States, ordering them to make inquiry in their respective districts, of the conditions with reference to the drinking habits of the people, and the means of supply, and of the requirements necessary for a successful export liquor trade from this country. And when, with the going out of the century, our nation entered upon new paths; when, in the exigencies of war, we entered upon a career of foreign territorial expansion, justifying this course and assuming this responsibility in the name of civilization and commerce,—the first branch of American commerce to receive the benefits of such expansion, the first agency of civilization to be brought into play, was the liquor trade. In spite of the declaration of such men as President Schurman, of Cornell University, the chairman of the first Philippine Commission, that the American saloon did us more harm there in the beginning than anything else—the Filipino children staggering when they played mock Americans—still of all trades, this was the one most conspicuously to follow the flag

and to receive the protection and fostering care of that flag. Thus, during the first full year of expansion, for the year ending June 30, 1899, the exports of liquor of domestic manufacture from the United States increased eighty per cent, the largest percentage of increase of any American export; the exports of agricultural implements coming next, with an increase of 63.3 per cent for that same year.

These things have raised a storm of indignation and protest among temperance people all over the land. But why? We do not complain here because the Government protects and promotes the liquor trade. We have simply shown that this follows logically and justly the principle of taxation. Granted the right of a nation to tax a trade regularly for its support, and the nation is in duty bound to do just what our nation is doing toward the trade in strong drink.

(II)

CHAPTER V.

ITS MEANING FOR THE LIQUOR TRADE.

THE Internal Revenue tax has added to the complexity and persistency of the drink problem, in the second place, in that it led directly to a thorough organization of the liquor business, for the purpose (1) of promoting its own efficiency and productiveness, and (2) of forming a power to resist legislative aggression. Out of the first has come the great growth and present wealth of the liquor business; out of the second has come the liquor "power" that has played so large a part in the subsequent politics of the nation. We will look at these in turn.

I. The levy of a heavy federal tax, in 1862, marked a radical change in the methods of business and in the forms of development of the entire liquor industry. Promiscuous liquor-selling now ceased. With small capital and indifferent business methods the liquor trade now became unprofit-

able, or impossible. Liquor had hitherto been plentiful and cheap. There were numerous small stills throughout the country, and no large capital was invested. As to the brewing industry, that was yet in its infancy.

But now there came a change. The grocery store vending liquors, and others engaged in the trade in a small way, either had to abandon it, or go into it as a business—with all that that implies. Many did quit. The rest proceeded to enlarge the business. First, more capital became necessary, and with it a more intelligent organization and management of the business. A larger investment of capital, in turn, required a larger income; which required larger sales, which made necessary the extension of the trade.

Then came in competition. This reacted upon the business as a further stimulus. There was a yet larger investment of capital, with correspondingly better facilities for production, and a yet greater vigilance in pushing the trade and finding markets. It was now that the economic formula, that demand creates supply, became reversed, and the supply was made to create a demand. “Mine

host" of the tavern and inn of former days disappeared, and with him went hospitality and simplicity. The drink-seller, now more and more of foreign birth, still had a pleasant smile for his customers, but it lasted only usually as long as the money lasted. Avarice had become his impelling power.

He no longer waited for customers to come in; he proceeded to draw them in. "Ice-cold," thirst-provoking signs were made to allure the oppressed in hot weather. A "Hot Tom and Jerry," perhaps, would draw thither the feet of the shivering in winter. What signs could not do, a smile would, and a personal invitation, with a free drink and a free lunch—of pickled codfish, red herring, and salted pretzels; for once awaken a thirst for liquor, and like licentiousness, it never goes backward. Start a saloon to-day in the most temperate community, and give it free course, and it will build up a good trade.

Saloons now occupied corner blocks, and were elaborately furnished. They were made attractive, to attract. Expensive plate mirrors were introduced—there's a charm about a mirror. At-

tractive paintings, usually the figure of a woman in gauze drapery, or other costume calculated to interest men, now greeted the eye on entering. The light became brighter, and the screens darker. Music was brought in as an adjunct to the business, and not infrequently, mingled with the strains of music and the clink of glasses, were heard the peals of woman's laughter,—she, too, brought in to attract custom. The drinking place remained either just plain “saloon,” or became “sample room,” or “palace,” or maybe, “Pete's Place,” just as might suit the tastes and conceits of each particular class of customers.

Now all this was made to serve but one end—light, screens, mirrors, music, pictures, games, free lunch, family entrance,—namely, to sell liquor. The frequent lavish displays of wealth, also, such as paving the saloon floor with silver dollars, looked to the same end. It sought either to introduce some striking novelty, or more generally, to maintain for the business an imposing respectability which is suffering constant peril. The aim is the same—to sell liquor. This sole motive, born first of necessity, received ever new impulse from the

very stimulus of success. The entire business was now driven with an energy and a wantonness unknown in former days, or in the methods of any other pursuit.

To this vigilance and enterprise of the liquor industry must be laid chiefly the increase in the consumption of strong drink in this country within the last generation. Our large foreign immigration during this period has had something to do with it, of course; but nothing less than the aggressive spirit of the business itself, first awakened by the tax, could have brought it about that, in spite of the growing sentiment of temperance throughout the land, and the increase in the number of no-license towns and districts, the per capita consumption of malt liquors, for instance, should have more than doubled on our rapidly increasing population. Besides, total abstinence is by no means unknown among our foreign-born population.

Another change in the organization of the liquor business is to be noted. As is inevitably the case with a growing business when competition is felt, the drink business has moved toward consolidation, the actual ownership and wealth pass-

ing into fewer and fewer hands. The weak have been eliminated or absorbed by the strong, who thereby have become yet stronger. Thus, according to the census, there were in the United States, in 1870, 1,972 establishments for the manufacture of malt liquor; in 1890 there were 1,509. The capital invested on the other hand, increased from forty-nine millions in 1870, to over four hundred and fifteen millions in 1890. In the distillery business the same tendency has been manifest, though perhaps in a somewhat less degree.

Not only has the manufacture of liquors passed into fewer hands, but the retailing business, also has passed largely into the same hands. Probably from one-half to two-thirds of the saloons to-day are owned by, and run in the interests of, brewers and wholesalers. These latter buy the building, put in the fixtures, furnish the liquor, pay the taxes and license; while the saloon-keeper is only a kind of employee. Such organization and pushing from behind has doubtless planted many a saloon where there would otherwise have been none, and thus promoted the sale and consumption of liquor.

Thus has the liquor business, by its compactness and efficiency of organization under the stimulus of taxation, attained prosperity and wealth and power.

II. The Internal Revenue tax of 1862 led, in the second place, to the banding together of the liquor interests for purposes of mutual defense against legislative encroachments. Israel conquered Canaan because the latter was made up of a number of petty and independent kingdoms that offered no united resistance. Before the war, the liquor industry was in many hands, and was carried on usually in a small way. Small stills were numerous, license fees were practically nothing, whisky was cheap, and the investments of capital were small. There was no organization or bond of union; no power to wield, therefore, or to fear. Consequently, when Maine began the decade of the fifties with a prohibitory law, other States followed and promptly passed similar laws, upon a simple expression of popular sentiment. There was no hesitancy by first calculating political consequences, on the part of legislator or politician. The liquor trade, from its very nature not much respected, was also not yet feared. It had not yet

found its voice, or become a factor to be reckoned with in politics.

With the Internal Revenue Act of 1862 all this was changed. On November 12, of that same year, less than three months after the law went into effect, thirty-four members of the brewing trade met in Pythagoras Hall, on Canal Street, New York, and organized the United States Brewers' Association. "Unity is Strength," the temporary president suggested as a good motto for their meeting. An agitation committee was appointed to correspond with the Internal Revenue Bureau, and a deputation soon afterwards visited Washington. In spite of the money needs of the Government at that time, they succeeded in getting the beer tax reduced, the following March, from one dollar to sixty cents, on the barrel. A year later, now without serious protest by the brewing interests, the tax of one dollar was restored. At the Brewers' Congress of 1864, in Milwaukee, the agitation committee was made permanent, and deputations to Washington became a regular feature of the work of the association. This was the beginning of the liquor lobby at the nation's capital.

But the liquor interests soon learned that they had no real hostility to fear from the Government. The tax had been levied, as it had been upon other articles, simply as a war necessity. In a very few years, in fact, it became apparent that the Government was enjoying the revenue from this source so well as to make it unlikely that any really hostile measures would ever be contemplated. The frequent presence, and friendly addresses of the officials of the Internal Revenue Bureau at the Brewers' Congresses, gave assurance to the same end. The tax, so far, was found not to have hurt the business any. It was only necessary to raise the price, for experience showed that those who drank would buy anyhow.

From its first work of protest, the organized liquor power now turned toward the exercise of congressional surveillance, to guard against any possible future legislative aggression. Such watchfulness was not wholly unwarranted. For while the Government has been friendly and intimate even, it has not always been moved by generous or manly sentiment in its dealings with the liquor business. Where genuine respect is wanting,

coupled with desire, this is perhaps to be expected. The drink business soon proved so willing a partner and protege, genial and growing rich, that the Government, an intimate associate in the business, with access to the books and the safe, has not always been free from the temptation to stretch its hands a little too far. This the assertion and self-respect of the organized liquor power has repelled through its point of chief impact upon the Government, the liquor lobby at Washington. Yet this has not angered the Government, and led it to an attitude of hostility. For this rebuke to its presumption, this resentment of its undue liberties, it has been led to think rather more profoundly of the liquor power. In this way the atmosphere was cleared, and a mutual understanding established,—a relation that, according to the annual protestations of both sides, remains cordial to this day.

The nation's capital, however, though the first scene of protest by the organized liquor interests, has not been the chief field of their activity. The Government happily avoids offense by shifting the whole vexatious temperance question upon the

States. Many of the States, following a like policy of evasion, through ostensibly liberal local option laws shift it upon the individual towns and municipalities. It is in these State and local campaigns that the liquor power does its most telling work. This is done by the employment of a single agency, a very potent factor in determining the course of politics—namely, money, judiciously expended.

Besides the national organization of brewers, an organization of the wine and spirit trade was effected in Chicago, in mass convention, October 18, 1886. It was named the National Protective Association, with John M. Atherton, of Louisville, as its president. Its avowed object was to resist the rising tide of prohibition, which at this time became very perceptible. This organization did effective work for about a dozen years. Its place is now taken by the National Liquor Dealers' Protective Bureau, a recent creature of the National Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association. The Distilling Company of America, better known as the Whisky Trust, paid all the administrative expenses of this bureau during its first year just closed.

The money resources of the liquor organizations are large. They usually have a large regular income from fixed annual assessments upon their members; and when special funds are required for special needs, there are extra assessments. These funds are at the generous disposal of State and local organizations for any special pressing work.

In large cases of liquor litigation these organizations furnish the financial backing. When in 1887 several Kansas cases were appealed to the United States Supreme Court, involving the right of compensation for a business outlawed by prohibition, it was the United States Brewers' Association that engaged the counsel, Senator Vest, of Missouri, and Joseph H. Choate, of New York, to argue these cases, paying them princely fees for their services. It was in these cases that the decision was handed down, denying the right of compensation to liquor dealers.

The influence of these organizations is also felt through the country in efforts made to bring the violators of the liquor laws to justice. No accused liquor-seller in any no-license town or prohibition State stands alone. If local money and influence

are not sufficient, he has the organized liquor power of the country back of him. This is one of the reasons it is so hard to get a conviction in a liquor case almost anywhere. But not only in violations such as these is the accused shielded by whatever power money can wield. In those graver crimes that not infrequently occur in connection with the enforcement of the liquor laws, this same power is felt. We will take a conspicuous instance, the murder of Rev. George C. Haddock on the streets of Sioux City, Iowa, on August 3, 1886. Haddock was a Methodist minister in Sioux City, and was at the head of a citizens' movement for the enforcement of the prohibitory law. He had in this way aroused the wrath of the law-breakers, and had been marked for death. Returning home, on the evening of this day, from a drive to a neighboring place, he left his team at the livery stable, and as he proceeded to go home a crowd collected to intercept him, in trying to pass whom he was shot and instantly killed.

The country was aroused as by an electric shock. Suspicion fastened upon a certain brewer, and he was at length arrested and brought to trial.

At a meeting of the Saloon-keepers' Association the night before the murder, it was he who had suggested putting Haddock out of the way, and had called attention to the fact that there was money in the treasury of the association that could be used to reward the deed.

The trial awakened widespread interest. Every one had confidence in the judge, but looked with suspicion on the jury. Strong evidence was presented by the prosecution. Yet at the conclusion, eleven of the jurors voted for acquittal. Why they voted thus they alone probably, and God, know. It is known generally, however, that the one man who held out for conviction had been approached and offered a bribe to vote for acquittal. A second trial was held. Even stronger evidence was presented; but to no avail. The jury, after a consultation that lasted about ten minutes, brought in a unanimous verdict of acquittal. The jurors then proceeded in a body to the photographer and sat for a picture, with the accused brewer in the center of the group; a proceeding, let it be here remarked, not of every-day occurrence in the annals of jurisprudence. The liquor interests of the

country, especially the United States Brewers' Association, were back of this case with money and influence.

Not only is the organized liquor power using its influence against the enforcement of prohibitory laws, in that it shields the law-breakers, and murderers even, when brought to trial, it uses its power to prevent the enactment of prohibitory laws in the beginning. To show some of the ways in which money is used when a campaign is on for prohibition, we will take a single notable instance, the Pennsylvania campaign for constitutional prohibition, in 1889. The people of that State were to decide by ballot whether prohibition was to become a law and to be a part of the State Constitution.

The liquor men had known that the fight was coming on, and had prepared for it. State and local forces were completely organized. The raising of money was first looked after. In Philadelphia the large hotels were assessed a thousand dollars each, and the small retailers from twenty-five to fifty dollars. Besides this, the sales of all beer were assessed at ten cents a barrel. Fur-

ther, each brewer was required to solicit money from every one with whom he had trade dealings, such as the barrel makers, those from whom they bought horses, grain, machinery, etc. In this way, \$200,000 were raised in Philadelphia alone for the State committee. These same methods essentially were employed over the State. The brewers of Allegheny County, it was reported, had subscribed \$35,000; and the Retail Liquor Dealers' Association of the same county, \$25,000 more. The trade from all parts of the country responded. The brewers of New York contributed \$100,000, and large sums were contributed by the United States Brewers' Association, and the National Protective Association. The total campaign fund was probably not short of a million dollars. The *Philadelphia Press*, in fact, estimated that this was the amount contributed in the State alone.

How this vast sum was expended may be seen from the following facts. Nearly all the newspapers of the State were found to oppose the prohibitory amendment. Every editor had been visited in person by the liquor interests at the opening of the campaign, and arrangements had been

made for his support. Weekly papers were paid from fifty to five hundred dollars, and the city dailies from one thousand to four thousand dollars each. Those papers that would not enter such a contract were paid from thirty to sixty cents a line for all matter published on the liquor side. The material was furnished them, for the most part, by the liquor literary bureau, written up by men paid for this special work, and to be printed as editorial or as news matter, as might be directed. Thousands of copies of these papers were then bought and sent out, especially to farmers, to whom such arguments as the liquor revenue, and how prohibition would hurt the farmers, appealed with peculiar force.

That the almost universal attitude of the press was not a matter of conviction, is made evident by a few facts. Upon the State chairman's statement, who managed the campaign on the temperance side, a former attorney-general of the State, at least one daily paper in Philadelphia stood ready, for a consideration of ten thousand dollars, to espouse the cause of prohibition. Papers throughout the State not only printed general matter fur-

nished by the liquor management, but they printed bogus articles, made up in Philadelphia, under the guise of honest dispatches from Des Moines, Topeka, Atchison, and other places in prohibition States,—giving what pretended to be facts and figures to show the failure of prohibitory laws, and the havoc wrought by them. These dispatches so called, were printed with the full knowledge that they were bogus. They appeared in the news column in the ordinary way, with nothing to indicate that it was advertising matter. When the managers of the campaign for the other side sent to the prohibition States and obtained from authoritative sources a complete refutation of these statements, this matter was refused publication in the leading papers except upon the payment of so much a line, and upon the condition that the correction should in each case appear with a mark to distinguish it as advertising matter.*

Another heavy drain upon the purse of the liquor management was the politician. There is always a purchasable vote in every campaign, varying largely with the amount of money avail-

* See article, *Const. Prohibition, Pennsylvania*, in *Cyclopedia of Temperance and Prohibition*. Funk & Wagnalls Co.

able for such purpose. It seems that Mr. Quay "bled" the liquor organization for three years, and then came near causing its defeat at the polls. The rumor became current that this money was being contributed to defeat Grover Cleveland for the Presidency. A movement was then set on foot to have the Democratic vote cast solidly for the amendment, to punish the brewers of the State. This was prevented by timely discovery, and by the liberal use of money in "fixing the boys," by such soft answer turning away their wrath. In Philadelphia the poll-list was bought of the county commissioners by the liquor interests, for their exclusive use, with the understanding that it was not to be returned until after the election.

Then some money went out for speakers, but not a great deal. It is the general practice of the liquor interests in any contest not to make large use of this means of campaigning. Probably good speakers are hard to get. Those whose services can be secured are of course well paid. In the Pennsylvania campaign Kate Field was said to have received \$250 a day, and expenses, for her efforts to convince her hearers that prohibition is bad for a State.

With all this money at its disposal, the committee on the liquor side was \$50,000 in debt at the close of the campaign, chiefly in accounts with newspapers. On the other hand, the State committee which managed the prohibition side of the campaign, though it had the influential support of such men as John Wanamaker, Governor Beaver, T. V. Powderly, ex-Chief Justice Agnew, and many other foremost men, there was but a comparatively poor equipment of funds from the beginning. The proposed prohibitory amendment was defeated by a vote of 484,644 to 296,617, and the average American citizen will diagnose this as a symptom that public sentiment is not yet ready for prohibition.

In conclusion: to claim that all this activity by the liquor interests is due entirely and chiefly to the Internal Revenue tax would probably be trying to prove too much. That the liquor interests would have opposed the propagandism of temperance and prohibition which has swept over our land since the Civil War, even had no Internal Revenue tax ever been laid, is more than probable. Such a thing was to be expected, of course, as a

plain matter of self-preservation. What we wish to emphasize is this: that it was the Internal Revenue tax which first directly aroused the liquor interests and put them in fighting fettle; that it is this tax which took the liquor business out of the hands of the many, and concentrated it in the hands of the few, thereby giving to it organization and wealth and power. In the hands of the many, with small profits, it could never have become the formidable power it now is. It could not have reached the compactness of organization, the unity and celerity of action, or amassed the immense corruption funds that it now has. No industry that is not in a measure a monopoly, and wealthy, and knows itself thoroughly, can have much influence in shaping or defeating legislation.

While it is, then, the vigorous temperance agitation everywhere that calls forth the constant resistance of the liquor power, it is the Internal Revenue policy of the United States that has, during these forty years put the liquor power in fine shape for the battle.

(III.)

CHAPTER VI.

ITS MEANING FOR THE FREE CITIZEN.

THERE is a third complication, finally, which the federal policy of taxation has introduced into the drink question. This applies also to State and local taxation under the license system. The complication is this: the payment of a heavy money sum into the public treasury by the liquor business has so blinded the eyes, seared the conscience, and sealed up the fountain of pity in the human breast, in the face of the daily manifest train of want and woe that proceeds from this traffic everywhere, that the whole drink issue has never yet been squarely met and fought out on its merits, whether it is good or whether evil.

That the drink industry itself, under the discipline of taxation, should from its first strenuous efforts for self-preservation have become strong and lusty, and wanton even, is scarcely to be considered strange. That the attitude of the Federal

Government toward this industry, this genial, rich patron, from whom it receives more than a fourth of its entire support each year,—that its attitude toward this industry should be one of devotion, this too is not unnatural or strange. But that the free-born American citizen, to whom it is given to see truth face to face; whose strength is not stayed; whose strong arm, beneath high heaven, is free to support or strike down; that his hands, consecrated under God to relieve the oppressed, to raise up the faint and the fallen, to lift up in this land of the free an ensign unto which the nations of the earth shall come for their healing,—that these hands, too, should have become unsteady and uncertain, itching for gold; this is unspeakably deplorable.

On the assumption that the liquor business is in a true sense a legitimate business, like any other, the whole license and special tax policy, from the heavily disproportionate burden it places upon this pursuit, is palpably and inexcusably unjust. That the business can stand this burden will not serve to justify it; it only raises suspicion. That the liquor business cheerfully pays this heavy tax,

and even advocates the policy, is yet more significant; it is itself a condemnation. On the assumption, then, on the other hand, that the liquor business is not like other pursuits, but from its very nature is fraught with evil, which a rigid legal restriction must and can effectually prevent,—on this assumption the entire policy of license and taxation, from the fact that after the fairest trial under such severest restriction the consumption of strong drink in the aggregate and per capita has grown, and the evils flowing therefrom have known no perceptible abatement,—this has proven the license and restriction policy a stupendous failure, and again without justification. A little clear thinking should have made this plain in the beginning. The way to restrict is to restrict, not permit—for money.

It remains, then, that because the liquor trade is willing and able to pay a large amount of money into the public treasury, the American citizen allows that it may work evil; refusing to suppress the evil because with it would cut off a source of revenue to the State. In other words, the American citizen sanctions and sustains the public drink

trade, not that it is good, but because he thinks it pays him well. It is Ruskin who observes that the condemnation resting on the world is not that men do not believe in their Lord, *but that they sell Him!*

The farmer sells the product of his land; the laborer, that of his hands; the professional man the product, or service of his brain,—for money. This money, as a medium of exchange and a convenient measure of material value, will in turn buy a suit of clothes, or a book, or a carriage, or the services of a railway company for a journey. These are commodities, and are, therefore, proper objects of barter or sale. The value of the one can be estimated, with some degree of approximation, in terms of the other. But in what terms shall the value of life be stated? How much will a man give in exchange for it? “All that he hath,” yet that will not buy it, nor will it represent the value of it. We have here come upon terms that are incommensurable. Life—the soul, unlike wheat or wood or gold, has no units of measure, of size or weight, or value. It can not possibly be exchanged, therefore, for any of these. Do

we allow a man who has deliberately taken a human life to expiate his crime by the payment of so much gold? No; he has to pay with his own life. Only in terms of another life can the value of a life be estimated. Indeed, so sacred is life that even this right of the State to take the wretched life of a murderer, is coming to be more and more questioned as civilization advances.

But there are yet higher values than life,—virtue, honor, love. To sacrifice life rather than virtue and honor; to perish in a labor of love—to such deeds all mankind pays tribute. If murder, then, is so grave a crime, when death is confessedly not the worst of evils, what shall we say of a sanctioned public practice whereby reason ends in insanity, and virtue in shame? How many dollars will represent the difference between that sad remnant of womanhood, with face once fair, now festered and foul, who, after having served the lusts of the flesh, has now been cast away to be trodden under foot of men,—and that other woman, with face yet fair and heart yet pure; a devoted wife, a tender and beloved mother of children, by grace queen of the home; com-

manding by her presence everywhere the involuntary respect and homage of men; how many dollars ought a man fairly to receive before he should hand over his sister or daughter to an institution that will transform her from the latter into the former state? The close relation between drink and impurity no man may dare deny. Drink opens the way into the citadel of virtue which would otherwise have been impregnable. Or how much money, again, will represent the difference between that man whose very presence is feared by his own children, and dreaded by his worse than widowed wife; whose daily earnings, left at night in the saloon till, serve to feed other mouths and clothe other bodies than those of his own family; who on returning home after midnight hours will curse and destroy articles of furniture that come in his way, and proceeding to his wife's bed, begets imbecility, and after ridding himself of discomfort by copious vomiting, sinks into a heavy sleep; this man and that other husband and father, whose home-coming is eagerly looked for by his little ones; who devoutly asks the blessing of God upon the frugal evening meal; who by industry and self-

denial is raising up a large family to usefulness and honor; to whom no appeal of religion or humanity comes in vain; in whose daily walk every young man finds an incentive to better living, and every woman a profounder respect—in what terms of money, by coolest calculation, shall we estimate the difference between these two men—their value before God, or to society? That widowed mother who spent many an anxious, weary midnight hour over the cradle of her only child; who nursed him to health and strength by her love and her prayers; who took from her own want that he might lack nothing; in whose requiting confidence and affection, his bright eye and fine promise, the mother found a joy and a cheer that made her very sacrifice sweet; how high a license fee ought a community to require of a liquor-seller that he may take this boy, give him liquor, and throw him into the gutter, or send him home to his mother—drunk?

How the tax-advocating citizen will work out such a question honestly in his own soul, if he does work it out, he alone probably knows. Probably he changes the form of the question, by that

same instinct whereby one involuntarily shifts his body from a position of discomfort to one of ease. Were he to give an absolutely candid and logical answer to this question he would say this: the money value of the ruin wrought the country over by the use of liquor for any given period, divided by the amount of liquor consumed during that period, fixes the appraisalment of damage done at \$1.10 for each gallon of whisky drunk, and one dollar for each barrel of beer consumed. This the distiller and brewer have to pay before the liquor goes out, a kind of penalty for making it. This is the Federal excise tax. Furthermore, the extent to which the retail liquor-seller contributes to the damage, by handling the liquor, is estimated at an average of twenty-five dollars each year. This is the Federal special liquor tax. According to the same Government schedule, the wholesale liquor dealer's part in the harvest of desolation is estimated at one hundred dollars a year; the rectifier's part, likewise at one hundred dollars. If he does a large business, however, and "rectifies" more than five hundred barrels a year, he is believed to do two hundred dollars worth of damage each year, etc.

This is the American citizen's estimate when he is acting in his federal capacity. As a citizen of the State he has a slightly different basis of computation. Here he does not concern himself with the brewer, the distiller, the rectifier, the maker of stills; he fixes the responsibility upon the retailer, the man who sets the liquor before the people to drink, the immediate agent of evil. Appraising the total human wreckage wrought by the fire, flood, and tempest of strong drink for one year, the citizen divides this by the total number of drink-sellers, and reaches an annual average damage for each, say of five hundred dollars. This is then fixed as the minimum annual rate, or license fee. This is the rate in Illinois, for instance. In other States, like Wisconsin, with a large alien population and a less enlightened conscience, the injury wrought is appraised at a lower figure. In Massachusetts, on the other hand, with its Puritan standard of morals, sobriety and manhood are appraised much higher. It takes not less than about twelve hundred dollars to get permission to sell liquor for one year in that State.

No; the citizen does not really want it to seem

that he is setting a money value on virtue, though in truth and before God he does do this very thing. He does not really look at it in that way, but he carries out the transaction just the same. He knows that the liquor business is fraught with evil, not potentially or casually, but actually and inevitably. He knows that an open public saloon in a community will spread evil and destroy morals, just as inevitably as a public well which has become polluted by sewage will spread typhoid fever, and cause death in that community. Not everybody gets water at that well. Not every one that uses the water will get typhoid fever; but a number will. Some will die. And the Board of Health will condemn that well!

Not every one in town goes to that saloon to drink; but it is there for that purpose, and many do go. Not every one that goes and drinks will be perceptibly affected thereby, but a number will, in their persons and finances—and their families. Some will be utterly ruined. And the citizen says, *Make him pay five hundred dollars every year!*

We must have revenue, the citizen says; and his eyes see and ears hear nothing but the gold as

it drops clink, clink, into the strong box of village or city. The liquor interests take advantage of this peculiar human weakness, and when a campaign is on for no-license or prohibition, word is passed down the line of the workers on the liquor side, as was done in the Pennsylvania campaign already mentioned, namely, "Do n't defend the saloon. Talk revenue, and how prohibition will hurt business." Just before a recent election there appeared on the first page of one of the leading dailies, in large letters, in a city which for culture, intellect, and morals prides itself as being the foremost city of America, words to this effect (an advertisement, of course, paid for): "..... dollars were paid into the city treasury of last year by the liquor trade. Remember this when you vote to-morrow." The citizens remembered. With such large figures in mind it would be hard, indeed, to think of anything else. Only one more thing let the citizen remember, over against this, namely: except for this revenue he would not tolerate the drink nuisance in any community, not for a twelvemonth.

But, never mind. It's done, and business is

business. How much has this bargain netted us? How much have we made, now—money? You tell.

“Well, in this town we get three thousand dollars a year. There are six saloons, which pay five hundred dollars apiece. This is paid promptly, the first of each quarter, in advance. Out of this we maintain our electric lighting, keep our streets and sidewalks in good condition. This money is easily raised, and lessens our taxes by just so much. Not only that, but the saloons bring trade to town. The town would be dead otherwise. They are the making of the town.”

Indeed. Then perhaps there is another side to this question, besides a right and a wrong side. Perhaps the evils connected with drink-selling are only necessarily incidental to any real material prosperity. Perhaps, after all, one son's degradation, one mother's woe, must not outweigh the material necessities and well-being of society at large. It may be true, we have not seen all sides.

“Yes; and besides these large sums that the saloons pay into the treasury of our towns, the liquor industry of the country pays a large part of

the expenses of our Government, in the form of revenue and special taxes. The people are already complaining of heavy taxes; yet except for this liquor revenue they would be taxed still heavier."

Indeed! Indeed! Indeed! So much money! There is another side, surely. And—but where do they get all this money?

Listen! Let us look at a thing here with steady, scrutinizing, unflinching gaze. *Where does all this money come from?* Do the distiller, the brewer, the drink-seller make it? That is to say, does the drink business, which does not dig this money out of the earth, but like other lines of trade receives it in exchange,—does this business, upon any principle of sound economy, earn this money by rendering adequate service for value received? If so, it then becomes an actual producer of wealth, and these millions constitute its assets—whatever its liabilities—and must be set down to its credit in its ledger account with society. Has this money been earned? That's the question.

The farmer who tills the earth and makes it yield her increase, becomes an agent of produc-

tion. The man who invents his implements for him; the man who constructs them; the man who furnishes the materials for them, who digs the iron out of the earth; whose sagacity and enterprise locates and opens the mine—these are all producers of wealth, creators of value. So is the man who builds your house, makes your clothes, rears the sheep, raises the cotton and flax; who builds a bridge, constructs a railroad, blasts a rock, levels a road; the miller who grinds the wheat, the baker who makes it into bread, the merchant who sells clothing and groceries, the banker who facilitates exchange, the teacher who imparts and fosters learning, the physician who relieves suffering and aids in restoring to health, the lawyer who gives counsel and protects alike the rights of the guilty and the innocent, the minister who comforts the sorrowing, brings hope to the despairing, and a nobler incentive to every soul—the prophet of a better life; all these, yes, and the man who digs a drain, or sweeps the pavement, or cleans your chimney, or shines your shoes, or curries your horse—all these add to the cleanliness, the comfort, the health and happiness of the world; con-

tributing to its material, intellectual, æsthetic, and moral wealth. Each of these has his place, and take him out of it, society would suffer, so far forth, an absolute loss.

How about the man who makes a living by selling liquor? Is he, too, a producer of wealth? Would the world be poorer if he were taken out of it? Does he, too, minister to human comfort and plenty and happiness, or encourage industry and economy, or promote skill, or foster education and religion, or offer incentives to better living? If so, to what extent? Do the three hundred million dollars which the liquor trade paid last year, in the form of special revenue taxes, licenses, and fees of all kinds, national, State, and local,—which represents but a portion of its profits, which, in turn, represent but a small portion of its income; are these three hundred million dollars to be taken as but a fractional indication, therefore, of the sum total of services which the liquor trade contributed to the well-being of this country during one year?

No; these millions simply represent a portion of the money that the saloon-keeper received from

the people who bought his ware. In return for this money he set before them beer, wine, whisky—alcoholic and intoxicating liquors, which ministered to no human necessity or comfort or well-being, but to an acquired and perverted appetite only. No home was thereby made happier, no heart purer, no life stronger. The saloon-keeper, in spite of the fact that he works early and late, and sometimes has to contend with beasts, has not *earned* one cent of his money. When people spend their money for that which is not bread, and their labor for that which satisfies not, we do not call this a purchase or an acquisition, but a waste at best. The liquor saloon in society at large is at best, from an economic point of view, a vast sewer into which the flood of human appetite carries each year millions upon millions of the people's hard earned money. The amount which society receives in taxes and license fees is simply that small portion which has been saved to it out of this waste sewage, the largest amount that the avaricious citizen, with soiled hands, has been able to fish out of this underground stream.

We know now where this liquor revenue comes

from, this magical money which the citizen is bidden not to forget on election day. We know now who contributes all this money that makes towns and cities and governments prosperous, and we know pretty well how much the citizen gets in return for his outlay. Three hundred million dollars is approximately what the citizen, by every device of taxation and fines, has been able to save out of this drain.

We want to look a little more closely now, to see how much really goes in there, that we may estimate about what is lost—absolutely and forever. Here a man's senses and understanding will fail him. When the United States official reports give out the information that in the course of a twelvemonth more than one hundred million proof gallons (*i. e.*, fifty per cent alcohol) of spirits were withdrawn for consumption, and of malt liquors over forty million barrels; and that, besides this, from eight to ten million gallons of wines and liquors were imported from other countries; besides the total production of native wines, which are not taxed, and the products of illicit distilling, of which a thousand and more stills are seized

each year by the Government officials; these figures become simply incomprehensible. They only confuse the mind by their very size, and leave but an indefinite impression of vastness. And when we read that the people of our land pay for this liquor, as their yearly drink bill, not less than one billion dollars, and very probably nearer a billion and a half, every object of man's knowledge and comprehension dwindles instantly into nothingness; the perspective is lost, and man murmurs only a weary, half-indifferent, half-incredulous "large."

William Hargreaves, M. D., of Philadelphia, author of "Worse than Wasted," estimated the drink bill of the United States for 1900 at \$1,465,000,000. He explains his method of computation; says he has made these estimates for twenty years, and that they have never been questioned; that he has laid them before gaugers of the revenue department, before ex-saloon-keepers, and other persons capable of judging, and they agree that his estimates are as nearly correct as it is possible to make them. He insists that his figures are conservative, below rather than above the actual cost. We will take only \$1,200,000,000 here, for purposes of comparison. This is probably on the safe side.

We will now place an object or two in the foreground, that we may better judge of distance and size. The public school system of our land, that best exponent of democracy and greatest factor in our national assimilation,—for every dollar that the American citizen pays in taxes for public education (\$200,000,000), he pays not less than six for liquor. Again, the United States of America, a country vast in extent, first in resources, great in achievement, liberal in expenditure, a world power—the total expenditures of this great nation for one year (\$593,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1902), covering the legislative, executive, and judicial branches; including the army, the navy, Indians, pensions, post-office, interest on public debt, and every other last item and source of expense; these liberal expenditures of a liberal government, which the citizens do not always contribute without grumbling, amount to just about one-half of what the same people pay out, in a like period, for strong drink. Subtracting, now, the \$300,000,000 which the liquor trade pays back to the people, and we have an absolute waste, or loss, of \$900,000,000 and upwards; one billion dollars, approximately.

Let it not be forgotten that this vast sum represents, at its best, an annual waste and loss. That the money is not sunk into the ocean, but is all kept in the country, does not make it one whit less a waste and loss. The expenditure has brought no returns. It is as if this country should engage half a million skilled workmen, set them at making pianos and fine furniture, having them furnish their own materials, and pay them an average of two thousand dollars a year for every man; then give orders that each night the entire finished product of that day's work shall be burned up. The money paid for this work all stays in the country, but it brings no return. It represents destroyed wealth.

We hear much in our country about the large standing armies of Europe. We are taught to look upon this institution as a burden and a drain upon the productive, honest industries of a people. Why a drain and a burden? The money paid out for the maintenance of standing armies all stays in the country. It makes business for the gold braid and brass button industries, the gun and powder factories. It creates model cities like Essen, and

makes Krupp millionaires; and any town where soldiers are quartered will witness lively times. How a drain, then, and a burden? For this reason: the taxpayer gets nothing in return for his money, except perhaps the spectacle of imposing field maneuvers and splendid sham battles annually. The armies eat up wealth and create none. They don't make their own living, but are supported by the country. They are a burden, therefore, to every honest toiler. For this reason the statement, that in Europe every workman carries a soldier upon his back, comes not far from being the truth.

Yet the United States could better afford to support a standing army of a million men, gathering up all the unemployed and relieving every overcrowded business and profession, and pay each man an average of a thousand dollars a year, having him out of this sum furnish his own board, clothes, and ammunition,—could better afford to support this body of men, and keep them shooting at targets, than it can afford to pay a similar sum to a nearly similar number who now spend their time and labor at making and selling liquor. Each

eats up the same amount of wealth of others' toil; neither gives anything in return; with this much in favor of the army—it would at least leave its supporters sober, probably very sober. This country could better afford to support in absolute idleness, as lords and gentlemen, the 200,000 men who run retail liquor establishments in our land, paying them \$5,000 a year, each, the salary of a United States Senator, than it can afford to pay the same sum to these same men, as it now does, for selling strong drink. Out of the money now spent for liquor, our Government could buy out, every six months, the entire wine, spirit, and malt liquor industry of the country, using land and buildings for the benefit of the people, and have a number of millions left besides.

We have in each instance said that our nation could *better* afford to do these things. The immediate money transaction would be the same. But while the citizen who supports a lord or soldier in idleness is out of so much money, he has himself left yet. He can still work and produce more wealth. But when the citizen pays out his money for liquor, while his money is gone—an absolute loss to him—that is not all; (and we are not speak-

ing of health or manhood or morals now, but just of money and material wealth.) The man gets drunk, say, and for the time being at least is not able to work. The value of so much of labor is lost. Or because of drunkenness he loses his place and is altogether without work. The wealth that his labor might have produced is totally lost, an absolute loss to himself and to society. He eats up and does nothing. Or because of drinking he becomes sick and thus loses his labor; or becomes a pauper and a public charge. Or he becomes contentious as the very common result of drinking, and destroys property or commits assault, perhaps a crime, even murder. Then society employs officers to catch him; pays a lawyer, judge, jurors, and witnesses to try him; builds a penitentiary to receive him; pays out money to feed him, a warden, a chaplain, and attendants to look after him. Or the man, as the result of drink, becomes a maniac, and society builds an asylum for him to live in, and pays out money to feed and keep him. Or he begets an imbecile child, or by neglect and example rears one to crime, or his family to pauperism; and society cares for them all.

Add up, if you can, the entire criminal budget of the country—the whole police machinery, court expenses, prisons, everything, for one year—and take one-half of this as representing probably at the very least the cost of liquor's aftermath in crime and disorder, either immediately or remotely; find the total amount expended each year in charity, privately and by the State, and the cost of our almshouses, and of the asylums, public and private, for the insane,—and take of these figures from one-fourth to one-third, as representing the amount traceable, immediately or remotely to the drinking habits of the nation; take these figures, together with the money value of labor lost and labor misdirected as the result of liquor, and add to them the one billion dollars spent annually, above all license fees received in return, for liquor, and you will arrive with some degree of approximation at the yearly cash account of the drink trade with society.

If it is true that in a country with a large standing army every honest workman carries a soldier upon his back, it is no less true that in a country with the public saloon system every hon-

estly toiling citizen carries upon his back either a brewer, distiller, or barkeeper, a pauper, an idiot, a maniac, a murderer, a policeman, or a criminal lawyer: and some of these are heavy.

Verily, the clink of the license money as it drops into the public cash-box has charmed the citizen with a fascination akin to that with which the magician's coin charms the rustic at the fair. So sure was the latter that he would have staked his very soul upon the guess, when behold! the coin was under the other hat.

An old farmer of the writer's acquaintance, now gone to his reward, once took a load of hogs to market. As the wagon stood upon the buyer's scales, and the attention of the buyer was for a moment diverted, the old farmer reached over and gave the balance weight a smart turn. The buyer, pretending not to have noticed it, proceeded to weigh the hogs, and when the farmer drove off thought he would adjust his scales, to see out of how much he had been cheated. He found that the farmer had turned the weight *the wrong way!* He had been willing and anxious to barter his conscience for a few pounds of pork, but—bad

bargain that it was—he was not bright enough ; he was cheated even at that. This man carried with him into his grave this confident, two-fold delusion : first, that no one ever knew of his tampering with the scales ; and secondly, that he made money by the transaction.

C. EDUCATION.

219

(I.)

CHAPTER VII.

MORAL MOVEMENTS SINCE THE WAR.

WE paused in our narrative at the year 1862, the year in which the Internal Revenue Act was passed, to consider the principle and policy of liquor taxation in its effect, first, upon the Government; secondly, upon the liquor trade; and thirdly, upon the free citizen. This necessarily led us on, to take into account those main facts of subsequent and recent history which pertained to these particular phases of our subject. We will now go back and see what form and direction the temperance sentiment of the country took in the meantime.

The Civil War was a great destroyer. It blighted in fairest blossom time the promised fruits of the maturing temperance reformation. A dozen States had expressed themselves for absolute prohibition of the liquor traffic. Others had adopted this policy in partial form, and every-

where sentiment was strong and growing. Temperance societies of many kinds and names had been active and increasing in numbers and strength. The progress of the reform seemed irresistible, and its culmination inevitable.

When the smoke of battle cleared away the aspect was changed. Temperance work had been paralyzed, and temperance societies impoverished of membership. Now after the long night watches, when the tension of fearful anxiety was relieved by the matin bells of peace, came the repose of weariness. All life and interest that remained was diverted to other channels—reconstruction and citizenship, problems arising out of emancipation and rebellion. Besides, during the night the enemy had arisen. He had entered a compact, and had gone out to destroy. A plan to do away with all existing prohibitory laws had been set on foot by him. For the first time, it seemed, he at once fully recognized his danger and his opportunity. In addition to all this, the home-coming soldier, with the demoralizing influence of camp life upon him, helped no little to undo what had been accomplished before the war for sobriety.

1. Temperance interest had, however, not been wholly inactive even during the war, and was by no means dead. Following immediately upon the close of the war, in the summer of 1865, a fifth National Temperance Convention was held at Saratoga, fourteen years after a last similar gathering had convened. (The first National Temperance Convention, it will be remembered, met in Philadelphia, in May, 1833.) This convention was conspicuous by the absence of the heroes of earlier temperance battles. Justin Edwards, mightiest organizer and leader in the early reform, had passed to his reward. So had Governor Briggs, fine type of man and public servant; and Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen, senator, statesman, college president, friend of every cause of religion and humanity. Lyman Beecher, too, at the ripe age of eighty-seven, had laid his armor by; so also had President Hitchcock, of Amherst, than whom few had done more in the cause; and Rear Admiral Alexander H. Foote, one of the first to introduce temperance into the navy; and Robert Baird, who personally planted the seeds of temperance over northern Europe in the early day.

Lastly, and recently, Lincoln had been taken, whose example and influence had been a pillar of strength to the cause. The country had not yet recovered from the shock of his death. Walworth, Pierpont, Delavan, and Marsh were still present, but only themselves soon to follow.

At this convention 325 delegates were present from twenty-five States, representing the Churches and the various temperance organizations. Governor Buckingham, of Connecticut, presided. During a two-days' conference papers were read on important topics by Rev. Dr. Chickering, of Boston; Rev. W. W. Newell, of New York; James Black, of Pennsylvania; and by Dr. Charles Jewett. It was resolved to form both a national temperance society, and a national publication-house; the former to concentrate all the temperance forces of the land by bringing together the different temperance orders and associations, the latter to prepare and circulate sound temperance literature. James Black was the moving spirit in the latter organization. Separate committees were appointed; but the two branches of work were united, and by fall *The National Temperance Society and*

Publication-house was formed. The American Temperance Union, organized in Saratoga, at the second national temperance convention, in 1836, was now merged in the new organization, and ceased to be. The basis of the new society was, total abstinence for the individual, and total prohibition for the State. Hon. William E. Dodge, merchant prince, member of Congress, Indian commissioner, Christian philanthropist, became the first president of the society, and J. N. Stearns, a man of experience and clear vision, became its efficient corresponding secretary and publishing agent.

This new society was destined to fill a large place in the work of temperance reform. Without affiliation of party or sect, but embracing all, it was to become a sort of large temperance university, devoting itself specifically to publishing and circulating effective temperance literature in schools, hospitals, jails, etc., and among the people generally, including the freedmen of the South. The society has also given effectual aid in prohibitory campaigns, sending out speakers and missionaries in the reform, and drafting and urging legis-

lative measures. To this society more than to any other one agency has been due the rehabilitation of temperance sentiment since the close of the Civil War.

2. In 1869 a few zealous temperance workers in the city of Buffalo, who were members of the Order of Good Templars, the Sons of Temperance, and the Templars of Honor and Temperance, having tried to secure the enforcement of the Sunday law against liquor-selling, and failed, became convinced that the people were not willing to give this question their serious thought and support, and that public sentiment must be created in favor of law enforcement, backed by the moral and religious elements of the community. To this end they launched a new order, the *Royal Templars of Temperance*.

This was not intended to be a rival of other temperance orders, but with a distinct mission in educational rather than reformatory lines. Its object is thus stated: "To labor unceasingly for the promotion of the cause of temperance, morally, socially, religiously, and politically." No special efforts were made to spread the order until, in

1877, it was reorganized on a beneficiary basis. Its prosperity since then has been mainly due to this change.

3. On February 22, 1872, the *Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America* was formed in Baltimore, by representatives of Catholic total abstinence societies from about a dozen States. Some of these temperance societies had been in existence since the days of Father Mathew's visit to America. There had been no bond of union between them, however, until 1871, when the societies of Connecticut formed a State Union. This suggested the idea of a general Union, and culminated in the meeting at Baltimore.

After the adoption of a constitution an address was issued to the Catholics of America. Rev. James McDevitt, of Washington, was elected the first president of the Union, and B. J. O'Driscoll, of the same city, its secretary. The pledge of the Union reads as follows: "I promise, with Divine assistance and in honor of the sacred thirst and agony of our Savior, to abstain from all intoxicating drinks; to prevent as much as possible, by advice and example, the sin of intemperance in

others; and to discountenance the drinking customs of society." Subordinate branches, State and diocesan Unions soon began to be formed. The aim of the Union has been to establish a total abstinence society in every parish throughout the land. Through this organization much has been given in relief to the poor and suffering, and halls have been built, reading-rooms and libraries established as counter attractions to the saloon. Through the labors, chiefly, of the Philadelphia Union, a magnificent fountain was erected in Fairmount Park of that city, and on July 4, 1876, in the presence of an immense concourse of people, it was dedicated to American liberty.

The Catholic Total Abstinence Union has received the approval of the Plenary Council of the Catholic Church in America, and the commendation and blessing of the Holy Father, the late Pope Leo XIII. Many of the foremost men of the Church, both among the clergy and the laity, are giving their active support to the Union and to the cause of temperance. The practice of the bulk of the Church, however, with respect to temperance, leaves yet much to be desired.

4. In 1881 the *Church Temperance Society* was formed in New York City. This is the temperance organization of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Its object, as stated in the constitution, is threefold: to promote temperance; to rescue the intemperate; to remove the causes of intemperance. As agencies for accomplishing these results it employs (1) the Gospel; (2) coffee-houses, as counteractives of the saloon; (3) improved dwellings for the poor; (4) healthy literature.

One peculiar feature of this society is that it is the only temperance organization that does not now stand upon unconditional total abstinence. Its basis is defined in these words: "Recognizing *temperance* as the law of the Gospel, and *total abstinence* as a rule of conduct essential in certain cases and highly desirable in others, and fully and freely according to every man the right to decide, in the exercise of his Christian liberty, whether or not he will adopt said rule, this society lays down as a basis on which it rests and from which its work shall be conducted, union and co-operation on perfectly equal terms for the promotion of temperance between those who use temperately and

those who abstain entirely from intoxicating drinks as beverages.”

Restriction rather than prohibition is the aim of the society, with reference to the traffic in liquor—stopping the sale on Sundays, to minors, and to drunkards; with high license and local option. The control of the society is under an executive board and the bishops of the Church. Robert Graham has been its efficient secretary from the beginning. The society aims ultimately to establish a branch society in every diocese, and a parochial society in every parish.

5. *The Reform Clubs and Gospel Temperance.*

The first Reform Club was formed at Gardiner, Maine, on January 19, 1872. The chief agent in its formation was Mr. I. K. Osgood, a man once successful as a merchant, but brought to ruin by drink. Coming home late one night, on approaching the house he could see his wife through the window, as she sat in her wretched home waiting for him. He resolved then and there, that by the help of God he would never drink again. After several months he induced another to sign the

pledge. They then called a meeting on the day mentioned above, inviting the public, and especially drunkards, to come and hear what rum had done for them. Eight drinking companions signed the pledge that night, and the first Reform Club was started. The movement attracted attention and spread to other cities, and clubs multiplied through the State and in other States by the labors of Osgood and his converts.

A larger work, of a similar kind, was that started by Dr. Henry A. Reynolds, of Bangor, Maine. Reynolds was a graduate of the Harvard Medical School, had served as surgeon in the Civil War, and was a practicing physician in Bangor, and—a drunkard. He had tried several times to break off, but in vain. A band of women were holding a prayer-meeting in that city; he went to the meeting and signed the pledge. At once he tried to help others like himself. He conceived the plan of a reform club made up of drinking men only. He gave notice of a meeting of drinking men, and the Bangor Reform Club was organized on September 10, 1874. With true missionary spirit others were brought in, and the mem-

bership grew rapidly. Excitement spread. Believing he had a call of God to this work, Dr. Reynolds gave up his profession and devoted himself to the reform. In one year forty-five thousand men had been gathered into Reform Clubs in the State of Maine. Reynolds then went into Massachusetts, and extended his labors westward into Illinois, Michigan, and other States. The badge of the movement was a red ribbon, worn by the reformed drinker, so that the clubs became known as the Red Ribbon Reform Clubs. Others also entered into the work. In 1877, John B. Finch, one of the most knightly, energetic, and invincible men that ever donned armor in the great reform, lectured in Nebraska in the interests of the Red Ribbon movement, securing a hundred thousand signatures to the pledge.

Of much the same character as the Reynolds Reform Club movement was the work started by Francis Murphy, at about this same time, and known as the Blue Ribbon movement. Murphy was in prison in the city of Portland, for drunkenness. He had ruined himself, and brought rags and shame to his family, through drink. While in prison he was visited by Captain Cyrus Stur-

devant, a Christian gentleman, and was induced to attend religious service. Murphy made a resolve with God's help to walk in a better way. While yet in prison he tried to save others from drink. He started in as a lecturer in Portland. Being well received he went elsewhere, and his power grew. Laboring first through the adjoining States, he turned westward, and soon the country became his field. The winter of 1876-77 witnessed a remarkable work in Pittsburg. There were over sixty thousand signatures to the pledge, and more than five hundred saloons in Allegheny and neighboring counties closed up for want of business. From there Murphy went to Philadelphia, where the results were nearly equally great. The Murphy meetings, which were continued for years after, were characterized by great fervor and power. But the work was not closely organized, and the results were not as permanent and far-reaching as they might have been, on that account. The blue ribbon, which Murphy had adopted as the badge of abstinence, was introduced into England in 1878, when a similar work to that of Murphy and Reynolds was started there.

6. At the close of 1873 there occurred a new, and in some respects the most striking, phenomenon in the whole history of temperance reform—an uprising of women, *The Woman's Crusade*.

To the outside world this crusade appeared like a kind of second reign of terror, the crusaders being likened to the French women who filled the streets of Paris, an angry mob, during those awful days of the French Revolution. In fact, however, the women of this crusade were persons of highest Christian character and culture, wives and daughters of governors, judges, clergymen, and of the leading professional and business men. Their weapons were not those of carnal warfare, but of the Spirit of the living God—song, prayer, entreaty—mighty to the pulling down of the strongholds of sin. In its intensity and contagion the crusade reminded one of the Washingtonian movement, begun in Baltimore in 1840. Only the latter was entirely divorced from religion, while the crusade was the soul of religion itself. Then men—reformed men—appealed to men as brothers to cease drinking; now women—mothers, wives, daughters—appealed to the saloon-keeper to cease

selling. The anguish of a woman's heart, upon whom the evils of the saloon always fall with most cruel and crushing weight, must now at last find expression. The wonder is that she had repressed her woe so long.

The crusade broke out in Hillsboro, a college town in southwestern Ohio, on the day before Christmas, 1873. Dr. Dio Lewis, in a temperance lecture the night before, had related how his mother with a few friends had, by prayer, prevailed against a saloon that had ruined her home; and he declared that the saloons could be closed in this way if women had only grace and courage and persistency enough. By a rising vote this idea was to be carried at once into execution. The names of seventy-five ladies of standing and influence were enrolled. A meeting was appointed for the next morning at the Presbyterian Church. At this meeting a committee was appointed to draft an appeal to liquor-sellers. Mrs. Eliza J. Thompson, the wife of a judge and the daughter of an ex-governor, was placed at the head of the undertaking. She became the leader and the mother of the crusade. Before going to this morn-

ing meeting, her daughter had opened her Bible at the 146th Psalm, and feeling its peculiar appropriateness, she told her mother that she believed it was especially intended for her. This psalm became the battle-hymn of the crusade. After prayer and organization, the women filed out of church, two by two, and singing "Give to the winds thy fears," they proceeded to the first dramseller. Every morning during the winter and spring these meetings of prayer were held; every saloon was visited, and nearly all were closed.

The night following his address at Hillsboro, Dr. Dio Lewis spoke at Washington Court House, another town in southwestern Ohio. Here, too, a praying band was formed. The appeal with which these women went forth was as follows—the form generally used later: "Knowing, as you do, the fearful effects of intoxicating drinks, we, the women of Washington Court House, after earnest prayer and deliberation have decided to appeal to you to desist from the ruinous traffic, that our husbands and brothers, and especially our sons, be no longer exposed to this terrible temptation, and that we may no longer see them led into paths which go down to sin and bring both body and soul to

destruction. We appeal to the better instincts of your heart, in the name of desolate homes, blasted hopes, ruined lives, widowed hearts, for the honor of our community, for our happiness, for the good name of our town, in the name of God who will judge you and us, for the sake of your own souls which are to be saved or lost. We beg, we implore you to cleanse yourselves from this heinous sin, and place yourselves in the ranks of those who are striving to elevate and ennoble themselves and their fellow-men. And to this we ask you to pledge yourselves."

Thus panoplied the band went forth the morning after Christmas, while others remained at church to pray, and while the church bell kept tolling, telling to all the community that concerted prayer and appeal were moving against the saloons in their midst. Where admittance was denied them, the women knelt in the snow on the pavement. The second day witnessed the first surrender, by a saloon-keeper, of his entire stock of liquor; and on the second of January it was announced at a great mass-meeting that the last liquor-dealer had unconditionally surrendered.

This movement, thus begun, spread like wild-fire. It covered the North Central States, crossed the Mississippi, swept through Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, and up into California and Oregon. Eastward it swept to the Atlantic. Its influence went out to the remotest parts of the land, even to the islands of the sea. In Ohio, the storm center of the movement, and where "Mother" Stewart became one of its foremost leaders, it was said that in two hundred and fifty towns the saloons had been closed as the result of the crusade.

This blaze of enthusiasm was as brief as it had been intense. After that, what? This: crystallization, organization. It led directly to the formation of that noble body of cultured, consecrated women, the largest number ever banded together in the cause of humanity, and the most potent personal agency, perhaps, in the annals of the reform, namely—

7. *The Woman's Christian Temperance Union.*

This organization was effected at a convention held in Cleveland, on November 18, 1874. During the preceding August, at Chautauqua,

New York, it was agreed by a few earnest women that the fruits of the crusade must be gathered up. A temperance prayer-meeting was called, to which about fifty women responded and were present. At this meeting, over which Mrs. Jennie F. Willing presided and Mrs. Emily Huntington Miller acted as secretary, it was voted to send out a call to all temperance organizations composed of women, to hold conventions in their respective States and send delegates to a national convention to be held in Cleveland, as before mentioned.

One hundred and thirty-five delegates, from more than a dozen States, responded to this call. An organization was effected, a plan of work adopted, and the following were elected as the first officers of the Union: President, Mrs. Annie Wittenmyer, of Pennsylvania; corresponding secretary, Miss Frances E. Willard, of Illinois; recording secretary, Mrs. Mary C. Johnson, of New York; treasurer, Mrs. Mary B. Ingham, of Ohio. An appeal was sent out "to the women of the great nations" for their co-operation, and a plan inaugurated to appeal to the President, to Senators and Members of Congress, to Governors, and to all in

authority, to lend the weight of their influence to the temperance cause.

Thus, in the fires of that soul affliction which welded together at white heat the anguished hearts of womankind in the crusade, did this organization receive its baptism. This sacramental blessing was never lost. It was to give to that body a patience and persistence, a consecration so genuine, a courage so undaunted, methods so practical and appealing, as had never before been known. A resolution placed on record at the very organization of this body reveals the spirit that banded these women together: "That recognizing the fact that our cause will be combated by mighty, determined, and relentless forces, we will, trusting in Him who is the Prince of Peace, meet argument with argument, misjudgment with patience, denunciation with kindness, and all our difficulties and dangers with prayer." The badge of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is a small bow of white ribbon; its motto, "For God and home and native land;" its pledge, "I solemnly promise, God helping me, to abstain from all distilled, fermented, and malt liquors, including

wine, beer, and cider, and to employ all proper means to discourage the use of, and traffic in, the same."

One of the prominent features in the early work of the Union was saloon visiting. It was soon learned, however, that the saloon is but an outpost of the enemy; that the real enemy lay in the rear and out of sight, entrenched behind breast-works of appetite and avarice, ignorance, and indifference, of wrong customs and false ideals, of law and politics. More emphasis was therefore laid on the larger plan of work. There must be counter-attractions and substitutes for the saloon—coffee-houses, social rooms, and the like, pure water fountains, homes for the inebriate, instruction for the young in church and school. The press must be utilized, literature distributed, lecturers and evangelists and missionaries sent out, and bodies in authority, in Church and State, memorialized to lend the weight of their influence to the cause, in the promotion of right sentiment and the enactment and enforcement of right laws. In order better to accomplish this larger and varied work, the committee plan was changed, in 1880,

into the department plan of work—organization, preventive, educational, evangelistic, social, and legal—with a capable and responsible person at the head of each department as superintendent. Under each of these six departments are a number of sub-departments, with superintendents. To this plan of organization has been due, in no small measure, the success of the Union in the various spheres of its activity. The *Union Signal*, an able paper published in Chicago, is the official organ of the National Union.

From its beginning the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has had a large place in its program for work among the young. Juvenile organizations were formed under the auspices of local unions, and auxiliary to them, in the various States. They bore different names, such as Juvenile Unions, Bands of Hope, Cold Water Armies, True Blue Cadets, Cadets of Temperance, and Loyal Legions. Many of these had been in existence for many years before. In 1886 a uniform plan of organization was adopted, and a uniform name, the Loyal Temperance Legion, with a national superintendent at its head.

Through the efforts of the Woman's Christian

Temperance Union, or specifically, of Mrs. Mary H. Hunt, the superintendent of the department of scientific temperance instruction, in co-operation with the National Temperance Society and Publication-house, text-books have been introduced into the schools, teaching the effects of alcohol upon the human system, and of narcotics. Beginning with Vermont and Connecticut, which passed such law in 1882, other States soon followed, until at the present time every State in the country requires scientific temperance instruction in its schools. Through the labors of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, again, by petition and appeal, the International Sunday-school Lesson Committee has, since 1887, devoted one lesson in each quarter to temperance. From the same source also has come largely the present practice by most Churches, of using pure grape-juice—unfermented wine—at the communion service. Among the successful recent labors of the Union was that which resulted in the enactment, by Congress, of the anti-canteen law, which shuts liquor out from the army post exchanges, an act approved February 2, 1901.

The example of the women in the United States led to the organization of the Dominion Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Canada, in 1885, and led to its introduction into England. Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt was sent as the first round-the-world missionary of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, beginning her journey in 1885. The result was the formation of a World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which has now branches and societies in many lands.

The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union has strenuously advocated the ballot for women, partly on the general principle of right, partly for the reason that in this particular reform woman should have the right thus to make her sentiment effective in law—she who, while suffering most, has been denied a hearing and redress. The work of the Union has been distinctively a work of education and moral appeal. While it advocates the abolition of the liquor traffic by law, it is a non-political organization. All parties have been appealed to, that they further in their legislative or executive capacity, or both, the cause of

temperance and prohibition. The general principle of the Union, oft repeated, is this: "We will lend our influence to that party, by whatever name called, which shall furnish the best embodiment of prohibition principles, and will most surely protect our homes." When at the national convention in St. Louis, in the fall of 1884, resolutions were adopted, after all parties had been appealed to, that the Union would lend its influence "to that national political organization which declares in its platform for national prohibition and home protection," adopted by a vote of 188 to 48,—this caused dissent, and led to a defection, through the leadership and persistent purpose of Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, of Iowa, and to the formation, in 1890, of a separate organization, under the name, "The Non-Partisan Woman's Christian Temperance Union." The head of the regular national organization, for several years now, is Mrs. Lillian M. N. Stevens, of Maine.

To name all who have rendered distinguished service in the cause of temperance would make too long a list. No mention of woman's work in temperance would be complete, however, without

the name of that gracious and gifted woman, so wise to plan, and strong to lead; respected and beloved of the people; the uncrowned queen of American democracy—Miss Frances E. Willard. Resigning her position as dean of the Woman's College and Professor of *Æsthetics* in Northwestern University, in June, 1874, Miss Willard began at once her career in the temperance cause. The scenes of the woman's crusade had stirred her. She was present at the organization of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union that same fall in Cleveland, as a delegate from Illinois, and presented at that convention, with grasp and foresight, a plan of work that was laid out upon the general lines which have since been followed by the Union. Elected its first corresponding secretary, Miss Willard was in 1879 elected president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, a position she held for nearly twenty years, until her death. For a number of years before her death she was also the president of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

During all these years Miss Willard was not merely the most conspicuous and commanding

figure in woman's work for temperance, but she represented in her rich intellectual endowments and Christian culture, her lofty and discerning purpose, her rare balance of judgment, and her wide sympathies, the best exponent of the entire modern movement for woman's emancipation. In her passing away, near the going out of the century—she died in New York City, February 18, 1898—the cause of humanity lost one of its stanchest friends, and among women its ablest advocate.

(II.)

CHAPTER VIII.

LEGAL AND POLITICAL MEASURES SINCE THE WAR.

THAT the prohibitory laws of the fifties, together with the heavy internal revenue tax of 1862 should awaken the liquor interests to an attitude at least of defense, was certainly not unexpected. They met the issue where, by the logic of evolution in temperance reform, and in the exigency of war, it had been brought, namely, in politics. The National Brewers' Association, organized in 1862, announced as one of its chief objects the wielding of political influence, to see "that its interests be vigorously and energetically prosecuted before the legislative and executive departments." It soon became evident that all prohibitory laws were, by concerted action, to be repealed. Aggressive campaigns were carried on in a number of States to this end. Of the prohibitory laws passed before the war, Delaware voted for repeal in 1857; Nebraska and Indiana in 1858; Rhode Island in

1863; Massachusetts in 1868, re-enacting the law the following year, and repealing again in 1875; Connecticut in 1872; Michigan in 1875.

As legislation is secured through political action, the determined and aggressive aim of the liquor interests henceforth was to influence and control the action of political parties. The National Brewers' Congress held in Chicago, in 1867, adopted the following resolution: "That we will use all means to stay the progress of this fanatical party, and to secure our rights as individual citizens, and that we will sustain no candidate, of whatever party, in any election, who is in any way disposed toward the total abstinence cause." By "this fanatical party" was meant the temperance contingent as it was found in, and working through, existing party organizations. This was the first clear announcement of that business-above-party, balance-of-power policy, at once the annoyance and fear of the political helmsman, by means of which the liquor traffic has been able to maintain a prolonged existence to the present day, in spite of the combined agencies of reform.

These things awakened those whose lives were

wrapped up in the temperance cause to a new and most serious danger. "If the adversaries of temperance shall continue to receive the aid and countenance of present political parties, we shall not hesitate to break over political bands and seek redress through the ballot-box," so the State Temperance Convention of Pennsylvania, held at Harrisburg, in February, 1867, had declared. The Brewers' Congress in 1868, in session at Buffalo, repeated in yet stronger language the resolutions of the preceding year, determined "to deprive the political and Puritanical temperance men of the power they have so long exercised in the councils of the political parties in this country." And when the temperance people observed that it was true, that they were being deprived of their power in "the councils of the political parties," and that the liquor interests were supplanting them in the exercise of that power, a growing conviction forced itself upon them of the necessity of independent political action.

Such step was soon to be taken. The Right Worthy Grand Lodge of Good Templars, the supreme body of that order, had declared for the

formation of such separate party at its session in 1868. The same body, in May, 1869, in session at Oswego, New York, repeated the declaration and recommended the calling of a convention for that purpose. A committee of five was appointed to issue a call, consisting of Rev. John Russell, of Detroit, one of the very first to advocate independent political action; Professor Daniel Wilkins, of Bloomington; J. A. Spencer, of Cleveland; John N. Stearns, of New York; and James Black, of Lancaster, Pennsylvania. The committee issued the following call:

“To the Friends of Temperance, Law, and Order
in the United States:

“The moral, social, and political evils of intemperance and the non-enforcement of liquor laws are so fearful and prominent, and the causes thereof are so entrenched and protected by governmental authority and party interest, that the suppression of these evils calls upon the friends of temperance; and the duties connected with home, religion, and public peace demand that old political ties and associations shall be sundered, and a distinct political party, with prohibition of the

traffic in intoxicating drinks as the most prominent feature, shall be organized.

“The distinctive political issues that have for years past interested the American people are now comparatively unimportant, or fully settled, and in this aspect the time is auspicious for a decided and practical effort to overcome the dread power of the liquor trade.

“The undersigned do therefore earnestly invite all friends of temperance and the enforcement of law, and favorable to distinct political action for the promotion of the same, to meet in general mass convention in the city of Chicago, on Wednesday, the 1st day of September, 1869, at 11 o'clock A. M., for the purpose of organizing for distinct political action for temperance.”

The call was signed by more than fifty prominent men interested in the cause, representing the different religious bodies, professions, and walks in life. How long, O Lord! Surely the time is now at hand. At last, at last; after the most determined and vigilant pursuit of the trail, encountered and worsted, eluding his pursuers again and again, the devourer has at last been tracked to his lair. Now for the fight unto death!

Pursuant to call, nearly five hundred delegates, from twenty States, met in convention in Chicago on the day appointed. James Black was made chairman, and J. A. Spencer secretary of the convention. A declaration of principles was set forth; an address, prepared by Gerrit Smith, was issued to the American people; and a party organized for independent political action. It was named the National Prohibition Party. Around this ensign all the temperance sentiment of the country was to gather for a final campaign of victory. The children of this world shall, in this instance at least, not outgeneral in wisdom the children of light.

The history of drink reform had now entered upon its final epoch. The successive steps in the movement had reached a logical and inevitable conclusion at this point. Nothing new has since been added; the last factor in the problem had been discovered. The real question since then has been, not to find the difficulty or a solution, but to apply to the manifest difficulty a solution already found. The proposed remedy has been bitterly assailed by friend and foe alike of temperance; but it has

never been fully or fairly tried. Many things, however, have been tried, all of which are interesting and suggestive to the student of the reform.

1. *The Citizens' Law and Order League.*

This originated in Chicago, in 1877. During the railway riots of that year it was observed that a large proportion of the rioters were half-drunken boys. Subsequent observations revealed the fact that a large army of such boys were habitual patrons of Chicago saloons, and were there receiving the beginnings of a transformation into drunkards, vagrants, and criminals. A few earnest Christian men sought a remedy, and a "Citizens' League of Chicago for the Suppression of the Sale of Liquor to Minors" was organized, with Frederick F. El mendorf as president, and Andrew Paxton as prosecuting agent. The first aim of the movement was to preserve the rising generation from habits of dissipation and vice. Starting with this single object, the purpose and scope of the movement soon broadened, including the enforcement of every restrictive liquor law, and the laws against gambling and other forms of vice.

Meeting with such success in Chicago, the

movement spread to other cities and States. In 1883, at a convention in Tremont Temple, Boston, a national organization was effected, taking the name, "The Citizens' Law and Order League of the United States." The growth of the movement has been rapid and spontaneous from the beginning. It had the sympathy and support of influential men from all classes and creeds. Mr. C. C. Bonney, of Chicago, was prominent in this movement, and for some time the head of the organization.

Although not in existence at the present time as a national organization, the law and order movement has done good service in toning up a lax public sentiment on the vital principle of the supremacy of law, and in showing that even where officials are inclined to do their duty in this respect, they must have back of them the co-operation and support of a determined body of constituent citizens. Local and State leagues are still doing effective work in many places. There is probably no more efficient organization of the kind to-day than the Law and Order League of Connecticut, whose continued success has been due to its capable and

energetic secretary and manager, Mr. Samuel P. Thrasher, of New Haven.

2. *The High License Policy.*

To enforce the law against the sale of liquor to minors, and the other countless restrictions placed upon the saloon business, was a difficult task. A more severe and practical restrictive policy, temperance men said, would be to raise the license fee. This will eliminate the lower and more objectionable resorts, it was thought, who can not pay such fee. The number of saloons, too, will be reduced, and the temptations to drink will be just to that extent lessened. Furthermore, by bringing the business thus within narrower limits, the task of police supervision will become easier and more effective; and, again, those who pay the high license fee for the privilege of doing business, it was thought, will themselves help to enforce the law against any who might attempt to sell without license. The larger revenue, lastly, thus derived from the drink traffic will better compensate the public for the evils it suffers from the traffic. Besides all this, some of the most ardent temperance men thought that this first severe restriction would

prepare the way for further and severer restrictions, until the traffic should gradually be taxed to death, or prohibited.

In this movement for high license Nebraska took the initiative, in the passage of the Slocumb law in 1881. This law fixed the minimum license fee at \$500 a year for towns with a population less than ten thousand, and \$1,000 a year for cities with a population of ten thousand or more. The framers and supporters of this measure were radical temperance men, John B. Finch among them, believers in the principle of prohibition, who looked upon this measure as a serious inroad upon the traffic, and an important step towards its complete destruction.

Missouri and Illinois, beginning in 1884, followed the example of Nebraska, fixing the minimum fee at \$550 and \$500, respectively. Most of the States have since then enacted high license laws, either fixing the minimum annual fee at \$500, or thereabouts, or providing a sliding scale, varying with the size of the city, or with the amount of business done, or with other contingencies. In these cases the fees range from about

\$300 to \$1,000, or as high as \$2,000 even, a year. In Massachusetts it costs not less than about \$1,300 to do a regular retail liquor business for one year.

The high license policy, which was originated by temperance men and opposed by liquor men, as a severe restriction and a step toward prohibition, has since then been espoused by liquor men and more and more opposed by temperance men, as the most effectual barrier to prohibition. Except that it yields revenue, it has disappointed its friends on every count. This one success is now its very condemnation.

3. *The Dispensary System.*

Another fact had been discovered. The reason the liquor-seller breaks over the restrictions imposed upon his business and sells to minors, to drunkards, on Sundays, and at all hours of the night, and in fact at any time or place that a man is on hand to ask for a drink, is his desire to make money. Indeed, this is the reason itself, it was discovered, that he enters the business at all, rather than from any religious or philanthropic motive to uplift his fellow-men. And the reason he can pay even a high license fee and still prosper, is because

there is profit in the business. This was the discovery.

The path of procedure, then, became plain: eliminate the element of private profit. To this end the business must be taken out of the hands who administer it for private gain, and placed in the hands of salaried agents who shall make no extra profit by pushing the sale.

This idea did not originate wholly in America. The principle involved here had been caught sight of in Sweden many years before. As early as 1865 the city of Gothenburg applied this principle partially to the sale of spirits. The city did not itself go directly into the business, but granted a monopoly of the sale of spirits to a private company, or bolag, to operate a limited number of public-houses, where spirits could only be obtained in connection with food. All the profits above a dividend of five or six per cent on the capital invested, the bolag hands over to the public; being at the present time divided between the city, the province, and the Agricultural Society. The bolag, or company, is required to place responsible managers in charge, paying them a salary, and to secure strict

supervision of all public-houses by private inspectors and by co-operating with the police. The sale of malt and vinous liquors is not farmed out and monopolized in this way.

In Sweden, where this system largely prevails, the companies are required to furnish food, and the drinking places are made attractive, the aim appearing to be to make the eating feature predominant. In Norway the companies, or *samlags*, as they are there called, furnish no food, no chairs, papers, amusements, or accommodations; dismantling the place of every feature of attraction. The customer swallows his dram and gets out. The profits here, above the dividend, until recently went to philanthropic enterprises; but on account of a growing protest to this practice, they now go almost entirely into the national treasury. These are the main features of this system, which is named, from the city of its origin, the Gothenburg System.

It remained for the State of South Carolina to make the first thorough-going application of this principle (*i. e.*, eliminating the element of private gain) by taking full charge of the business of

liquor-selling, and pocketing the entire profits. The dispensary system went into effect July 1, 1893. The State got into the white apron, put on the proper smile, and waited for customers. It was not that the people wanted it so. In the election of 1892 the drink question had been submitted to them for an expression of sentiment, and they had voted for entire prohibition by a majority of eight thousand. A bill to this effect, providing for complete prohibition, was brought before the legislature, but it was headed off with a dispensary substitute, which was brought in and rushed through by the friends of the governor, Benjamin Tillman, and signed by him.

Under this act the State has entire control of the liquor business, and all who handle liquor are its salaried agents. A State Board of Control exercises supreme supervision. A State commissioner is the agent through whom all liquors must be purchased by county and local dispensers. The dispensers are appointed by county boards, upon application indorsed by a majority of the voters of the town or city in which liquor is to be sold. The liquor is sold in sealed packages, as purchased

from the State authorities, and is not to be opened or drunk on the premises. The profits on sales go to the State, county, and local treasuries. These are the general provisions of the law, though in its details it has been modified many times. The dispensary system is in operation also in a number of counties and towns in Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, and elsewhere. South Dakota repealed her prohibitory law in 1897, and passed a dispensary act, which was done in such hurry that it was found to be unconstitutional; which leaves the State now under license.

To those who hold that all permissive measures relative to the liquor traffic are wrong in principle, the dispensary system offers but little satisfaction. For a State to go directly into a business that debauches her citizens makes the wrong, in fact, only the more grievous. On the other hand, those who rest all legislation relative to the drink traffic on the basis of expediency solely, they, too, will find but little to encourage them in the results that have attended the operation of this system. In South Carolina the consumption of liquor has not been lessened; the criminal budget has not been re-

duced; illicit sales have not ceased; and the question has not been eliminated from politics. To pay a man a salary and set him over a business, and expect him to do as *little* business as possible—this is an anomalous situation.

These measures and expedients, just named, have to do with the policy of regulation, stopping short of the complete prohibition of the liquor traffic—although the Law and Order Leagues work under prohibition as well as under license. We will now look briefly at efforts that have been made during this period for the complete suppression of the liquor traffic.

4. *State Constitutional Prohibition.*

The prohibitory laws of the fifties were simply statutory enactments by the different State legislatures, passed in response to the sentiment of the people. The successive repeals, by the different State legislatures, of most of these laws after a few years, revealed the insufficiency of this policy. It led to this reflection: the constituency of a legislature changes with every election. A statute law enacted by one legislature may be repealed by a subsequent legislature, and this without direct

reference to the sentiment of the people, which may remain unchanged in its favor. The likelihood of legislatures doing this very thing became enhanced just in proportion as the liquor interests became a political power, and held a club over the head of every candidate for office—or slipped a purse into his pocket after he got into office. To rescue the temperance cause from this precarious situation, it was seen that the prohibition policy must not be left for its fate in the hands of the office-seeker and politician. It must be safeguarded by the people, where the law will not be sacrificed to serve personal or party interests. The people must therefore, by vote, insert a provision in their State constitution which will at once compel the legislature to enact a prohibitory law, and at the same time will prevent that body from repealing the law until the people themselves have first voted to that effect.

Thus originated the movement for State constitutional prohibition, which began its success in 1880, and ended, after many hotly contested conflicts, in 1890. Kansas, first in the irrepressible conflict of slavery, was also to take the lead in adopting this, the most effectual method so far, in

this equally irrepressible conflict. It had been proposed in other States, but Kansas was the first to carry it into effect. The constitutional amendment was carried by a vote of the people of Kansas, in 1880; going into effect May 1, 1881. Iowa passed a similar amendment by popular vote, in 1882. On a slight error in transcription the amendment was declared unconstitutional; but the legislature, yielding to the pressure of an aroused and determined public sentiment, enacted a prohibitory statute law, which went into effect July 4, 1884. Maine, strengthening her statute law of years' standing, passed a constitutional amendment in 1884; Rhode Island in 1886; North Dakota and South Dakota in 1889. In the following States the proposed prohibitory amendment was defeated at the polls: Ohio, in 1885—the amendment failing to receive a majority of all the votes cast, though it had a large majority (82,000) of all who voted on the question; Tennessee, Michigan, Texas, and Oregon, in 1887; West Virginia, in 1888; Washington, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire (complete prohibition), in 1889; Nebraska, in 1890. The

aggregate vote in these several States—all of them, where prohibition carried, and where it did not—was: Against, 2,072,722; for, 1,758,895; with nearly a million not voting either way. This entire movement was toward settling the drink question a State at a time, and by a strictly non-partisan, popular vote.

5. *National Constitutional Prohibition.*

This was a hope only, labored for, but never consummated.

While temperance people generally were turning toward State prohibition as the remedy for the defective statutory prohibition, a number, seeing the necessary inadequacy of any mere State legislation on this question, went a step farther and argued for national constitutional prohibition. State prohibition is good, they agreed, but national prohibition is for obvious reasons better, and the only final remedy. The method for securing the latter was to be precisely the same as in the former instance, namely, the non-partisan method. As in the former instance the legislature submitted the amendment to the people for their approval, so Congress, in this instance, was to submit such amendment.

The United States Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of both houses of Congress proposing the amendment, which, when ratified by three-fourths of the States, through their legislatures or by special representative conventions, shall become a part of the Constitution and fundamental law of the land. Let temperance men therefore see to it that such senators and members of Congress shall be elected from their several States and congressional districts as are favorable toward a prohibitory amendment. It matters not what his party affiliations are, so he will only vote for the amendment. It matters not even whether he himself is for license or for prohibition, so he will only agree to have this question submitted to the people for their judgment. And "what political party which cares for political freedom, can deny to the millions who desire to be heard upon this tremendous question . . . the exercise of this fundamental right?" In this way it was thought to be comparatively easy to get such amendment before the people, and once in the forum of the people, to carry it to victory.

The most earnest and hopeful advocate of na-

tional constitutional prohibition was, perhaps, Hon. Henry W. Blair, of New Hampshire, from whom the foregoing words are quoted. Senator A. H. Colquitt, of Georgia, also, was as pronounced for prohibition as he was distinguished and honored in public service, and tried for years to get Congress to act on this question. Mr. Blair was the first to introduce into Congress a joint resolution, in 1876, while a member of the House of Representatives, proposing an amendment to the Constitution. This amendment was made to apply to spirituous liquors only, leaving the traffic in malt and vinous liquors for each State to decide; and was to go into effect with the year 1900. The reason for making the amendment cover half the ground only was the hope that it would, in this form, stand a better chance of carrying; and that, when once in force, the destruction of the traffic in fermented liquors would follow. Mr. Blair introduced this resolution in every succeeding Congress, changing the form of the amendment, after a few years, to complete prohibition.

In the meantime, in 1884, at the national convention of the Republican party, strong efforts

were made to induce that party to declare in its platform in favor of submitting the question of such amendment to the people. A resolution, drafted by Senator Blair, was presented to the convention by Senator Rollins, and Miss Frances Willard, the president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, spoke before the committee—to quote from Blair—"like an angel from heaven."

But the seed fell on stony ground.

6. *The National League for the Suppression of the Liquor Traffic—Non-Partisan and Non-Sectarian.*

The League was organized in Boston on January 1, 1885. The bitter animosities awakened by the Presidential campaign of 1884, on account of the intrusion of the drink issue into national politics by the Prohibition party, led many to the conviction that the temperance cause was being hazarded in thus being tied to the fortunes of partisan politics. It was in opposition, therefore, to party prohibition that the League was formed. What the prohibition party sought to achieve through separate party action the originators of this League averred could be accomplished only

by non-partisan action, the voice of all the people. The former, or party method, divides the temperance sentiment of the country; the latter, or non-partisan method, unites it. Thus "thrust forth by Providence, in a great public exigency," the League was launched under circumstances most auspicious. Rev. Daniel Dorchester, prominent in temperance work and literature, was made its president, and Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, its general secretary. Among its other officers and directors were, Hon. John D. Long, Hon. John Wanamaker, Hon. Henry Metcalf, Judge Daniel Agnew, Rev. Edward Everett Hale, Rev. Albert H. Plumb, Hon. John Farwell, Mrs. Mary A. Livermore.

The League called upon persons of all classes and creeds to work and vote against the liquor traffic in every way, and everywhere, without reference to party, or within existing party lines by regular means of procedure. Attention was called to the fact that the dozen or more prohibition State laws enacted before the war were passed without the existence of a "third party," and that "all the wonderful advances of the temperance reformation

from 1826 to 1860, moral and social transformations scarcely if ever equaled, were effected on a non-partisan basis."

Over two million pages of literature were printed during the first twelvemonth of the League's existence. The League died not long after.

7. *The Anti-Saloon Republican Movement.*

The Presidential campaign of 1884 was the most memorable since the days of slavery. The Prohibition party had purposely postponed its nominating convention that year until after the national conventions of both the larger parties had been held. Some expression favorable to the temperance cause was eagerly looked for from one or the other of these parties. Not only the Prohibition party, but the wider temperance interests of the country, were represented at both conventions, to make appeal on behalf of a common cause. To this appeal the Democratic platform responded: "We oppose sumptuary laws which vex the citizen and interfere with personal liberty." The Republican platform declared: "The Republicans of the United States, in national convention

assembled, renew their allegiance to the principles upon which they have triumphed in six successive Presidential elections."

The complete ignoring of the temperance question by the Republican party led to a considerable defection from its ranks, including such men as Governor John P. St. John, General Clinton B. Fisk, and John B. Gough. The tenor of this revolt is best expressed in Gough's own words: "For forty-two years I have been fighting the liquor trade—the trade that has robbed me of seven of the best years of my life. I have long voted the Republican ticket, hoping always for help in my contest from the Republican party. But we have been expecting something from that party in vain, and now, when they have treated the most respectful appeal from the most respectful men in this country with silent contempt, I say it is time for us to leave off trusting, and express our opinion of that party."

The defeat of the Republican party in that campaign, for the first time in a quarter of a century,—a defeat due largely to the non-committal attitude of that party on the drink question, and

the consequent largely increased vote of the Prohibition party,—led to that interesting phenomenon, the Anti-Saloon Republican Movement. This differed from the National League, just mentioned, in that it was avowedly partisan. What the Prohibition party sought to accomplish through separate, or “third party,” effort, and the National League through popular, non-partisan action, this movement sought to attain through the Republican party. It originated within that party, with those who, while believing in prohibition, were also deeply attached to the name and traditions of the Republican party; who believed that this party, which had been brought into being on a great moral issue, and had carried that issue to a glorious consummation, was able also to carry through the great temperance reform. To commit the Republican party uncompromisingly to that issue was the object of this movement. It originated with the temperance Republicans of Kansas. To “save the grand old party from disintegration,” and in full hope of settling the drink question, a call was issued by Albert Griffin, editor of the *Manhattan Nationalist*, on December 1, 1885, for a national

convention of Republican foes of the liquor traffic, to meet in Toledo the following May; declaring that the time had come when this issue must be squarely met and fought out, and that "the Republican party must and will mount a temperance platform."

Such language, however, Mr. Griffin found on his tour through the Eastern States, was too radical to be acceptable to party leaders, and but little enthusiasm was manifested. The call was then withdrawn and a second call was issued, framed in more judicious speech, for a national conference to be held in Chicago, September 16, 1886. Conferences were held in a number of States to elect delegates. Some two hundred representatives were present at the Chicago conference. Senator Henry W. Blair was the temporary chairman, and Hon. William Windom, one of the best men the party ever had, was made permanent chairman of the convention. The party press had not been wholly friendly to this movement, and not many of the influential party managers were present. The convention adopted a platform, or declaration of principles, and selected a national committee, with Albert Griffin as chairman.

At the approach of the Presidential campaign of 1888, a second conference was called to meet in New York, on May 2 and 3, 1888. "The Anti-Saloon Republican movement has now reached a magnitude and a momentum which nothing can withstand," the call declared. "It no longer pleads for a hearing. It commands compliance. It proposes to place the Republican party where it belongs, positively and finally on the side of home and public safety, as against the saloon system and its destructive work. . . . Speaking for an overwhelming majority of Republican voters and good citizens, we respectfully, but most urgently, ask our brethren of the Republican National Convention, which is to meet in Chicago in June, to incorporate in their platform of principles a declaration of hostility to the saloon as clear and as emphatic as the English language can make it." The conference sent a deputation, headed by Dr. H. K. Carroll, to plead the cause before the platform committee at the Republican national convention.

This seed again fell on stony ground. The convention platform made this declaration: "We reaffirm our unswerving devotion to . . . the

autonomy reserved to the States under the Constitution; to the personal rights and liberties of the citizens in all the States and Territories of the Union." Just before adjournment, however, several days after the platform had been adopted, the convention, on prudent second thought, tacked on the following "Boutelle" resolution: "The first concern of all good government is the virtue and sobriety of the people, and the purity of the home. The Republican party cordially sympathizes with all wise and well-directed efforts for the promotion of temperance and morality,"—which was scarcely either as clear or as emphatic as the English language could have made it.

Soon after this the Anti-Saloon Republican movement, which had enlisted in its behalf some of the best men and women in the party, passed into history.

8. *The National Anti-Saloon League.*

This is the latest agency in the field, to many a kind of David of the Lord's host, which, with omni-partisanship as its sling, and agitation, legislation, and enforcement, as its missiles, is to destroy that arrogant Goliath, the American saloon.

This organization seeks to enlist all existing temperance forces in united and aggressive work. It is affiliated with no party, and has no party ends to serve; members of all parties work together under it. In this it differs from the other movements which went before it. The Prohibition party seeks to overthrow the liquor traffic through "third party action;" the Anti-Saloon Republican movement sought to attain this end through the Republican party; the National League, through any means EXCEPT through the Prohibition party,—it being really a move in hostility to that party. The Anti-Saloon League is not sectarian, yet it is essentially Christian,—the Church at work for temperance, engaging with weapons both of spiritual and of carnal warfare its most opposing and destructive foe. Unity, Perseverance, Victory, are its watchwords.

The Anti-Saloon League labors for practical results. While the destruction of the saloon and the liquor traffic is its ultimate goal, it insists on doing the immediate best thing. Where it can not destroy, it seeks to cripple. By insisting on the enforcement of existing restrictive laws; by urg-

ing the passage of more stringent and prohibitive laws; and by literature and agitation awakening a sustaining public sentiment, the League is laboring in every possible and practical way to hamper, restrict, restrain, close in and kill, the open, legalized liquor traffic.

The first Anti-Saloon League was formed in Oberlin, Ohio, in September, 1893. A national organization was effected in Washington, December 18, 1895. The League is at present organized in nearly all the States and Territories. It expends a quarter of a million dollars annually for its work, scattering literature, and employing the entire time of some two hundred men, two-thirds of them regularly ordained clergymen. Rev. P. A. Baker is the present general superintendent, with headquarters at Columbus, Ohio.

(III.)

CHAPTER IX.

GROUND WON AND GROUND OF CONFLICT.

IN the long struggle for sobriety, which has been waged with unprecedented, almost unabated, vigor during the century just closed, two great and decisive issues have been successively fought and won. The first has established a correct personal principle for the individual; the second, a correct public policy for the State. These are, in turn:

1. *Total abstinence from intoxicating liquors as a beverage.*

This proposition has really passed the stage of argument. Time settles some things, and this must be considered one of them. After one hundred years of earnest debate, when the champions of both sides have been heard, it is time, in the parliament of free discussion, to apply the rule of closure. No case in law can drag on endlessly. When the evidence is all in, and the bearing of this

evidence on the case at hand and its relation to the law in question has been set forth, the case goes to the jury for a verdict. It is many years now since the Christian conscience, on gathering evidence from the drinking customs of society, first gave its decision that even the moderate regular use of strong drink is indefensible. Upon every subsequent appeal this verdict has only been reaffirmed, and upon increasingly strong and universal testimony. That verdict, bearing to-day the seal of the best thought and best life in Christendom, the tribunal of ultimate appeal, must be considered final. Judgment is already being served; beginning, as always, with the house of God.

The findings in the case are, in substance, as follows:

First—The liquor habit is a fearful habit. Men become in bondage to it with fetters as cruel and hopeless as ever shackled felon or slave. There is no drinking community that has not its slaves to this appetite. Under the power of this habit a man not only undermines his health, squanders his substance, and brings himself and his family to want; but what is worse, he loses his self-re-

spect and the respect of his fellow-men. His own manhood, the dearest interests of his family, the most sacred things in life—all are sacrificed to his love for liquor. He loses his interest in events around him, and becomes gradually insensible to his reproach. Before the eyes of all, who are helpless to save him, he goes down daily, and passes hence, a hopeless failure and wreck of a man, to an ignominious grave. Aside from, and in addition to, this typical instance there are all degrees of alcoholism and occasional drunkenness, with their varying concomitants of shame and evil. The blanched bones from a million graves rise up and cry out to the living, *Beware the drunkard's drink!*

Secondly—This human wreckage, which no man can number or find out, has all come from moderate and supposedly harmless drinking. The custom of society which says that the moderate use of liquor is permissible, is responsible for it. From moderation men have ever gone over to excess, in spite of self-assurance that they would not, and determination that they should not. In spite of all preaching and moralizing that men exercise self-control and remain within the bounds of modera-

tion, they have ever been unable presently to exercise such self-control, and have ever exceeded such prescribed bounds. To have totally renounced the cup in the beginning would alone have saved them.

Thirdly—The strong have a duty toward the weak. If the safety and salvation of the latter lies only in entire abstinence, it is the duty of the former to encourage these, by their own example, to practice such abstinence. No man lives to himself, and no man dies to himself. No man may put an occasion of stumbling in his brother's way. Nay, he must help him. If my drinking liquor causes my brother, who follows my example, to be made weak and to fall, I will quit drinking for his sake. This is according to the highest code of ethics that the world has received, and my conscience approves that it is right. My conduct in this particular becomes from now on a matter of *principle*. Not to do so, in the face of such reasoning, would be *unprincipled*.

The moderate drinker walks before all the world in dangerous places, which when others try to do, with less steady nerve and sure balance, they

fall. His influence as far as the example he sets, therefore, is worse than that of the drunkard. No one cares to imitate the miserable wretch who falls reeling in the gutter. The sight of him acts rather as a deterrent to the use of any liquor. But when your leading citizen, who is respected by all, is seen to take his daily drink, every mother's boy will reason that what that man does can not be wrong for him to do; and some mother will know sorrow.

Did the beverage use of liquor serve any necessary and indispensable purpose in our daily economy, the case would be different, and the ethics of moderation might rest upon a more valid foundation. But drinking is not indispensable; is not necessary at all. It is not necessary to make men healthy and strong. The athlete and prize-fighter discard liquor when they go into training, and men and women everywhere enjoy good health without it. Liquor is not necessary to promote longevity. If any corroboration were needed in addition to our common observation, the actuaries' tables of our life insurance companies are conclusive on this point. Liquor is not necessary, again,

to make the brain clearer or the hand steadier. In our large industrial and commercial establishments preference is given, other things being equal, to those who do not use liquor; and in not a few industries, such as railroading and the like, where the largest risks and gravest responsibilities are involved, it is becoming increasingly the practice to employ no man whatever who uses liquor in any form. Lastly, liquor is not indispensable to the promotion of those interests in life which stand out above all as chiefest, namely, the personal and domestic virtues—chastity, honor, reverence, love.

These things need no more than the stating. Many of them are so obvious, and all of them are established upon such evidence, that there can be scarcely any one who would presume to enter a denial. As a matter of fact, the average man who uses liquor will not pretend that he does so for any of these reasons. His excuse, if he takes the trouble to offer one, is that it does n't hurt anybody; it does n't hurt him. But no man can look upon the ruin wrought among men by strong drink, and reflect that such catastrophe would have been averted, and would again be averted from a sure

recurrence, except only for the drinking custom of society,—no man, we say, can understand this and continue to raise the cup to his lips, for the mere pleasure, and escape guilt. Some mightier potency for good will have to be established for our drinking custom, other than the plea that it does no one any harm, before, in view of the appalling evils that flow therefrom, it can be longer justified.

Fourthly—Man has duties toward himself. This, placed last here, should perhaps come first. Self-preservation is nature's first law. And self-preservation means not the saving of the body merely, but the saving of the real self—the man. No prayer is more oft repeated by human lips than this, Lead us not into temptation! Which means at the very least, if it means anything whatever, that man is not to walk into temptation with open eyes, just for pleasure. To defy danger and take serious risks when some prize of love or humanity is to be won, this is the act of a hero. But to risk both body and soul recklessly, when nothing is sought to be gained and everything may be lost, is nothing less than foolhardy, which is not merely wrong, but may be wicked.

Now, it has just been said that the strong have a duty toward the weak. But with reference to the use of intoxicating liquor, in the power to resist its evils, who are the weak, and who the strong? How is this to be determined, and when? In the beginning were they not all strong, as they thought, and was there one who had not unquestioned confidence that he would never be brought under the power of strong drink? Yes, some there will be who will succumb, each man knew, but he would never be one of them. This was the assurance, not of a few, but of every single man. The final roll-call revealed that many had succumbed.

What principle, now, shall the oncoming generation adopt for its guidance, from among whom strong drink is to reap its next harvest of death? Can it be told from the appearance, or size, or age, or birth, or nationality, or intelligence, or wealth, or any other outward circumstance or condition of the individual who are to be its outcasts through drink? Absolutely no. Experience alone can determine that, and then only when it is too late. Every man who drinks liquor takes chances for evil. Whether these are small or great, he has no

means of knowing beforehand. If he can not resist the enslaving power of liquor, he will not become aware or convinced of it until his own experience has brought him into such enslaved condition; and then, like those who go in at the gate of the scarlet woman, he will never return. Even those who have for years tasted of the intoxicating cup without apparent harm, can not say that they may not yet be brought under its power.

Thus, while a kindly and unselfish regard for his fellow-beings should lead a man, for the sake of those who are weak and are sure to err through drink, to renounce the cup, a sober regard for human worth and a decent respect to his Maker should lead him to take care of his own life. No man may climb to the pinnacle of the temple and cast himself down.

Up to this point we have accepted the common distinction between drinkers as "moderate," and "intemperate." We have assumed the contention of the former to be valid; namely, that while moderate drinking may not do any particular good, neither does it do any particular harm. We have pointed out, upon the basis of this very contention,

that instead of making the moderate indulgence in liquor permissible, the right rule of conduct still condemns it. Man should abstain entirely, in the first place, as a right example to the weak; and for his sake, secondly, in removing himself from a temptation which he has no right to assume that he has exceptional power to resist; it has ruined so many. But there is a third consideration which makes the common beverage use of liquor, even in so-called moderation, indefensible. It lies in the nature and effects of moderate drinking itself. This shall be our final inquiry upon our present theme.

As used in common speech, what do we really mean by moderate drinking? And is such drinking harmless? While the term is not very accurately defined, we may say that a "moderate" drinker is usually thought of as a person who has not been brought into visible bondage to liquor. He drinks regularly, or on occasion, but he has not formed what men distinguish as the drink habit. Although he does not do so, yet it is said that he could let liquor entirely alone, if he wanted. He is not known as a man who gets drunk. To

the common eye he displays none of the physical symptoms that are clearly attendant upon typical cases of alcoholism. This, in a word, by inclusion and exclusion, gives us a rough composite which men would recognize as that of the moderate drinker.

Now, is evil—both moral and physical—all on the side of that which is excluded by this definition of the moderate drinker? May not the continual introduction of alcoholic liquors into the human system exercise a disturbing influence on the finer, subtler functions of body and brain, and effect slow degenerative changes in tissue, which the average man is not likely or able to discern? Do not men die daily, as a matter of fact, from alcoholism of the heart, of the kidneys, or of the liver, under different names, without the world, or they themselves even, ever knowing it,—men against whom the suspicion was never raised that they drank other than moderately? Who knows in how many cases of mental and bodily disease alcohol may not form, if not the immediate or direct cause, at least a predisposing or contributing cause? Or how many years may not have been

cut off from a man's life because of alcohol; or to what extent the physical weaknesses and peculiarities of any of us, our mental and moral incapacities, may not have been determined by the drinking habits of our progenitors. And aside from the physical changes that may be wrought by the long and constant use of strong drink, are there not some very plain moral effects visible immediately upon indulgence in the cup by those who would resent the imputation that they were drinking other than moderately? The loosening of the tongue, and the bonds of self-restraint generally; the racy story, the questionable jest, the liberties of speech and of conduct—are these to be excused, if not exactly as exemplary, yet as harmless? The German is often cited as a model instance of moderate drinking. And what effect has such drinking had upon this people? Is it not a fact of observation by thoughtful men that the beer drinking of Germany has stifled the idealism and the finer feeling of its people, and has produced, especially among the academic youth of the nation, as seen in its beer jokes, its beer literature, and its beer conversation, an almost incredible vulgarity?

Do not some of the foremost medical men in Germany to-day declare this to be a fact? And did we not read just in yesterday's papers of a masterful address on "Alcohol and Art," delivered by Professor Behrens, Director of the School of Arts and Crafts at Dusseldorf, before the ninth International Anti-Alcoholic Congress in session at Bremen, in the presence of fourteen hundred delegates from fifteen nations, how the drinking habit is dulling that spiritual aspiration and finer perception in men so necessary to the greatest achievements in art? Is not conduct also one of the fine arts, nay, the highest among them; and does it require, for its highest achievements, soul qualities less spiritual and less refined than to carve a statue or paint a picture? Is it a matter of small concern that the best in life should thus be quenched and cut off by a public habit of self-indulgence that finds its stronghold in custom, and dares even to claim the sanction of religion?

All this, it must be remembered, comes within the pale of moderate, every-day drinking, and is not usually even mentioned in the indictment against society's drinking customs. Yet the pres-

ent writer does not hesitate unreservedly to confess that it was his observation, in boyhood days, of these very effects of moderate drinking in a German speaking community—the relaxed manners in social drinking, of a people otherwise and naturally decent—that first moved him to disgust, and led subsequently to determined convictions upon this entire question.

Nothing has been said thus far of the scientific phase of the alcohol question. We have purposely refrained from so doing. No great moral reform, in the first place, ever comes through the laboratory. It must come through the conscience, by such facts and reasoning as lie within the scope of common sense and the common powers of understanding. If the people believe not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe though one rose from the dead. Again, Satan himself can quote authority, which serves only to confuse or deceive, unless one can read with discrimination. Thus, for instance, when Professor W. O. Atwater, of Middletown, Connecticut, conducted some experiments a few years ago upon a university janitor, whom he had confined in a specially constructed

metal chamber, which he called a "respiratory calorimeter," and fed partly on alcohol,—when the professor announced that he found the alcohol to have been oxidized in the system, and to have served some uses as fuel, though it did not make new tissue or repair the machine, all the drinking world—men who care more to bolster up a habit than to know the truth—shouted for Atwater. As though the careful conclusion that a given quantity of alcohol can, under certain conditions, be oxidized in a healthy human body were a *Come on boys!* for everybody to step up and take a drink. It would seem that if it requires such painstaking, careful experimentation by an expert to determine the value of alcohol for the human system, it should require an equally careful prescription by an expert—the physician—to determine under what conditions, and in what quantities, alcohol should be administered in any given case.

These experiments of Professor Atwater, it may be mentioned, were made under the auspices of the Committee of Fifty, a self-constituted body, since 1893, for the impartial study of the liquor question. The gentlemen comprising this body

hold very conservative views, for the most part, in the matter of temperance.

On this subject of the attitude of medical science toward alcoholic liquors we will quote but a single authority. We deem this sufficient, first, because of the pre-eminence of the person among the recent men of medicine in America; and secondly, because his statement is safely conservative, representing a position from which the world will probably never again move backward. The testimony is that of the late Dr. William Pepper, Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, author of the great work on medical practice, who says, as quoted by Senator Henry W. Blair in his book, "The Temperance Movement:"

"Commonly one hears the question put in this form: Is alcohol a food or a poison? It is neither the one nor the other. It is not a food in the common and correct acceptation of the term, though it has points of resemblance with foods. It is not strictly speaking a poison, though it often produces highly-poisonous effects. It is to be regarded as a medicine or a drug, and belongs to the same class with opium, Indian hemp, tobacco, and some anal-

ogous substances. Nearly all healthy persons can with impunity take occasionally a small amount of dilute alcohol. With some individuals, however, even the smallest quantity disagrees and disorders digestion; on the other hand, a very small proportion of individuals seem able to take large amounts regularly for many years without damage. But I do not doubt that this impunity is more apparent than real, and that nearly all such persons are slowly but surely injured by the habit. One of the worst features of the action of alcohol in a large number of young persons is that, though taken in small amount and even in the form of light wines or beer, its first agreeable effect is followed by a feeling of lassitude and depression, readily mistaken for debility, and suggesting a repetition of the stimulant. But these unpleasant feelings are the direct result of the presence in the blood and tissues of poisonous matters, coming from the imperfect digestion of the alcohol, or food with whose complete assimilation the dose of alcohol has interfered. Here evidently is a fruitful source of functional disorder; and still more is it a source of gradually-increasing use, ending

in actual excess, with its inseparable physical and moral degradation. It is impossible to exclude from our consideration this enslaving tendency which separates alcohol so widely from all ordinary articles of diet, and relegates it to a special class of drugs. I am indeed satisfied that all persons in good health are better without alcohol in any form or in any amount, as a regular beverage. If this is true of dilute alcohol, by which I mean light wines or beer, or greatly-diluted spirit, it may be asserted without hesitation that all stronger forms of alcohol capable of causing positive local stimulation or irritation of the stomach, should be regarded purely as drugs, and be used exclusively under medical advice. Their habitual use by healthy persons is highly injurious and involves the risk of developing serious disease. It is, however, impossible to deny the great value of alcohol even in large amounts during critical stages of some acute diseases. And I can speak with confidence of the beneficial effects, in suitable cases as determined by a physician, of small amounts of dilute spirit, or of generous wine, taken as a stimulant by weak and elderly persons. While, how-

ever, we admit the therapeutic value of alcohol in these and other suitable cases, it is clear to me that every medical man should prescribe it with a distinct recognition in each individual case of the special danger attaching to its habitual use."

If alcohol, then, is not properly a food for the body, but must be classed as a drug, or medicine, with opium and kindred substances, it would seem that there could be no such thing as a rational, "moderate" use—constantly, indiscriminately, and self-prescribed, by all classes, and on all occasions—of such drug or medicine.

But if all this does not yet make clear this entire matter of moderation, we will add a final testimony in the form of an experiment. In order to determine accurately just what quantity of alcohol is harmless and "moderate," and what quantity is injurious and therefore "intemperate," numerous thorough-going experiments have been made independently by men whose scientific authority is unquestioned, with the following results: Doses of 7-10-15 grams (one-fourth to one-half ounce) of alcohol, which corresponds to a glass of wine or a pint of German beer, are sufficient regu-

larly to paralyze, retard, or disturb all the central and centripetal brain functions. By delicate measurements it is found that the number of mistakes in such exercises as typesetting, memorizing, calculating, etc., is increased. Sensibility is blunted, and mental reaction is retarded. The subjective consequences of the effect are agreeable; one feels heat, cold, and pain less; one is not merely less accurate, but less scrupulous, less afraid. A very slight veil of illusion has spread over reality, which is the beginning of later intoxication by larger doses.

Such are the first *effects* of alcoholic liquor. This explains at once why men are tempted to drink; why the habit grows, and why drinking usually goes before immorality and crime.

To say nothing of the advanced status of the total abstinence cause in this and other English-speaking lands, when we note the awakening of other nations to the import of this reform, and read that such men, for instance, as Forel, of Zurich; von Bunge, of Basel; Weigert, of Frankfort; Delbruck, of Bremen; Moebbins, of Leipsic, and lastly, Kraepelin, of Heidelberg, who stands

at the head of authorities on diseases of the mind, and to whose clinic medical students from all lands resort,—when such men, we repeat, change their personal habits and prejudices of a lifetime, and renounce even the moderate use of beer and light wines; and raising their voice and pen against the custom of a whole people, become pronounced leaders in a propagandism for complete abstinence,—the friend of sobriety and of humanity, who has labored long and hard in the cause, may well rejoice. It makes one feel that now is our redemption nearer than when we first believed.

2. *The suppression, by State and nation, of the traffic in alcoholic liquors for beverage purposes.*

This is the other decisive issue that has been won in the long warfare against the drink custom of society. This is clearer, if anything, than the first. When we come to consider a public institution like the traffic in intoxicating liquors, which fattens, not upon the ambitions and virtues of mankind, but upon its vices; which pumps into the body politic—without surcease night nor day—disease, insanity, degeneracy, pauperism, lust,

crime, corruption, pain, and woe,—an institution, we repeat, which does this, and can produce no record of good—there is but one attitude that a State can consistently assume toward it, and that is its suppression. The right of a State to do this is no longer open to question; nor its duty. What a man eats and drinks is his own concern primarily; and any change which one may seek to effect in these habits of an individual must be left to reason and moral appeal. But what a man sets up business in, and keeps open house for, on our main thoroughfares, becomes public business, and may be suppressed in the interests of decency and good order. As far as lies within this sphere, what the people's welfare demands, the State not only may but must do.

To say that the saloon exists only in response to a human demand, namely, the natural craving for liquor in man, which no legislation can take away, will hardly do. If this were true, indeed, that the saloon exists to wait upon, and take advantage of, a human weakness, it would scarcely make this business out to be of a character that should receive the official approval of a State. In

such case the State should at the least withdraw from it its express permission and protection, and give the moral forces among its citizens a fair chance to cope with this appetite. But instead of saying that the saloon merely supplies a universally existing appetite, it would be nearer the whole truth to say that the saloon first incites the appetite which it so cheerfully ministers to. Men learn to drink in the saloon. The open door, the screens, the light and attractions within, the free lunch and free drinks, these draw men in—are intended to draw them in. Did the saloon exist just to satisfy some inborn, irresistible appetite, there would be no need for such attractive and elaborate saloon furnishings. The man who goes in because he must have his drink cares nothing for plate mirrors and paintings. He will get to the bar if the floor is n't paved with silver dollars. Indeed he will pass through dark and narrow passageways, so we are assured, and up a rickety flight of stairs perhaps, and before a hole in the wall swallow his dram without so much as stopping to see how artistic the surroundings may be. Or he will take it—yes, will be delighted with the chance thus to

get it—from the man who brings it around in his bootleg, or in a hollow cane, or from the lady who carries it, quite conveniently, in a metallic bustle. When such simple means and small outlay of capital suffice to satisfy a want that our Creator has given us, it would show but small business sagacity to rent corner blocks and put in them paintings and plate glass, and wine stalls, and family entrances, and electric fans, and salted victuals, and music, and games, and peeping, and other devices,—poor calculation, we say, thus to squander money if people will drink anyway. A wise man would put his new silver dollars in the bank instead of in the saloon floor.

No; the public saloon and saloon system is a vast organized inciter of human appetite. It is an omnipresent, publicly sanctioned temptation to evil. It exists not because man, by nature, must drink, but because, by proper incentives, man can be made to drink, and there is money in selling it to him. The craving of large numbers of people for alcoholic liquor is no more to be charged to the Creator than is the craving of certain people for opium, or of many for tobacco, or the irresistible

tendency of others to utter themselves in copious profanity. These, and others like them, are strictly acquired habits, perverted and evil habits, acquired in association with companions of evil. These are among the offenses of which Holy Writ says, Woe unto them by whom they come! The curse of Almighty God is heavy upon the tempter to evil. And because the public traffic in strong drink is precisely such a tempter on a vast scale, provoking those very elements of evil in man which the agencies of religion and of civilization are constantly endeavoring to suppress and eradicate—and undoing in large measure their work,—the State must suppress it. The State must exercise the same authority by which it now permits and protects this business, to prohibit it. It must do it.

Indeed, this scarcely needs any lengthy argument. People are pretty generally agreed that no saloon in a community is better than the best existing saloon, and that if the liquor business could be effaced from the earth it would be a rich blessing to humanity. Men are coming to agree pretty well, too, that the saloon can never be removed and the traffic suppressed by means of coffee-houses,

ice-cream stands, club and game rooms, reading-rooms, drinking fountains, mission rooms and tracts. As long as the saloon has permission to do business, it will make life hard for all of these self-constituted philanthropies; it will run them out eventually. The saloon must be removed by the same power which gave it existence—the State, namely; and through the same agency—the law, * backed by a correct public sentiment. Then for > coffee and ice-cream and reading-rooms! Men are pretty well agreed, again, that to abolish poverty, or to equalize industrial conditions that produce poverty, would not remove the saloon, or mitigate its evils, on the plea that it is poverty which leads men to drink. If it were thinkable that a man who has no money will regularly go to the saloon and buy that which he has no money to buy, and can not get without money; if it were psychologically probable that a man who is poor and miserable will deliberately take to drink which makes him yet poorer and more miserable,—it is a very plain fact, whether or not men take to drink because they are poor, that men are poor—and their families—because they first took to drink. With

the saloon doing business, itself one of the most constant and prolific sources of poverty, the task of abolishing poverty will be uphill work. Let the saloon be first removed, the impoverisher of the people, which robs men of their hard-earned money and gives them only rags and woe in return; then the grocer, the house furnisher, and the savings bank will have their inning.

No; all this does not have to be seriously argued before intelligent people. On all this men are sufficiently agreed. But what beyond this point? Here men can not see as clearly.

While we have been brought up squarely at the point of prohibition, still the fortunes of the prohibition policy have been so varied, and its success in many of the States where it has been tried apparently so doubtful, that many an honest man, who has no difficulty in discerning what is right in principle, begins to be perplexed. He begins to question whether what is right and good is also always expedient—that is, practicable. For which misgiving, in this instance, there seems to be no little ground. Towns and cities that have voted no-license constantly change back, after a short

time, to the saloon; and even while no-license is in operation there is more or less liquor sold. Who can be sure when the saloons are cleaned out that at the next election they will not be voted back? And is this not true of State prohibition as well? Just about an even dozen States that have had prohibition in our own land, have repealed it—even Vermont recently, after fifty-one years of continuous complete prohibition, and New Hampshire, after forty-eight years of partial prohibition, early in the year of grace, 1903. Some States, like Massachusetts and Rhode Island, have not fewer than twice passed a prohibitory law, and as often repealed it; while after all the hard struggle for prohibition during more than fifty years now, the prohibition policy is in force to-day only in three States—Maine, Kansas, and North Dakota, with forces constantly at work here for resubmission and repeal.

Now, the cause for such reversal of policy has not been that the people had, in each case, discovered some new blessing in the saloon, or that they had found a better method of stopping its ravages; or that they themselves had come to love sobriety

and quiet less,—but rather, generally speaking, that they had not been able to make prohibition work well. “Very hard to enforce,” its friends reluctantly conceded; while the enemy carried the day with the slogan that prohibition does n’t prohibit; that as much liquor is sold as before, and the further consideration—always added—that the people get no revenue. From all this the common-sense generalization is made that it is never wise to enact laws in advance of what public sentiment will sustain.

These observations are far enough removed from the beggarly elements of the reform to deserve respectful and thorough consideration. We have here come to a point where it will require clear and penetrating vision, or we shall lose our way.

It is true, then, that the real reason why prohibitory laws have not been sustained, and the drink question, which half a century ago seemed surely to be approaching a final settlement, is today as far as, or farther, from a solution than ever,—is the real reason for this that the temperance sentiment of the country has at no time been

sufficiently advanced? Shall we say that this sentiment has not only not grown, but that the continued repeal of prohibitory laws has been evidence of its constant recession; and that to-day, when there are fewer State prohibition laws in force in our land than for fifty years, there is less pronounced and widespread sentiment against the saloon than ever? Is the real difficulty with the public sentiment? When, after an agitation which for intensity, duration, and universality knows no parallel in the history of any other similar reform; when the pen, mightier than the sword, is on every hand enlisted against the Philistine of strong drink, and every school and church-bell peals out its death knell; when from the innumerable undisturbed public pursuits the liquor business alone is singled out and humiliated with every kind and manner of legal restraint, of business exclusion, and of social ostracism, and aside from the bald fact that it yields revenue, finds not a single conspicuous public defender; when in spite of the poor enforcement and general handicap hitherto of prohibitory laws; at the risk of boycott in business, at the risk of personal danger, and in the face of the damn-

ing temptation of the "revenue" and "trade" arguments urged for the liquor business,—when in the face of these things individuals and communities have again and again voted to sustain the no-license policy, and not a State that has not its considerable area under prohibition—in some instances from two-thirds to three-fourths of its entire area—shall it be seriously said, and with reflection, that the reason why the long struggle against the open, State-sanctioned traffic in liquor is not already clearly within sight of its goal, is because not enough sentiment has yet been created on this question? How much sentiment does it require in a democracy to make the will of the people effective in law?

Or to come closer to the point still. Is it true in those States, specifically, which have enacted a prohibitory law by the deliberate choice of their voting citizens, that public sentiment in those States does not sustain the enforcement of that law? What did the people pass the law for? The people of Iowa, for instance, on June 27, 1882, voted for constitutional prohibition by a majority of 29,759—155,436 voting for, and 125,677

against. Ordinarily such majority in such vote would be quite sufficient to inaugurate and carry out a change in governmental policy. Yet there are not wanting those who loudly asserted that prohibition in Iowa was a failure from the beginning; and that it ceased we know. Was not prohibition, as a matter of record, amply justified by its fruits, taking the State over? If prohibition really was a failure, wherein was it that it failed?

Again, the people of the State of Rhode Island, on April 7, 1886, voted for constitutional prohibition by a more than three-fifths majority vote,—15,113 voting for, and 9,230 against. Even if one were inclined to question the sufficiency of the Iowa majority, surely here we have a majority—nearly two to one—large enough thoroughly to carry out any policy. Yet the law was not enforced, and after three years, the people in disgust and despair repealed prohibition by a vote of nearly three to one. The people will not sustain prohibition, was said. If prohibition in Rhode Island was a failure, why was it a failure? Must public sentiment be stronger—poll more votes yet? In what way must it be stronger?

Once more, the people of the State of Maine, at the fall State election in September, 1884, voted for constitutional prohibition by a majority of three to one—70,783 voting for, and 23,811 against. There can be no disputing that such a vote shows a very strong sentiment in favor of prohibition. And when we reflect that this vote was that of the male population only; that had woman, who also has convictions on this subject, been permitted to express these convictions in votes, and those under twenty-one just fresh from school—with these added considerations, we can not but say that the backing of prohibition in Maine, in the popular electorate and in the moral sentiment of the entire people, is—or was—literally overwhelming. Yet there are those who have faith to believe that prohibition is not succeeding in Maine, and never has succeeded. Public sentiment does not sustain prohibitory laws, is proclaimed abroad. You can get liquor anywhere, some say. Others enter an emphatic denial, and affirm that prohibition is a success. So how shall we tell? We would naturally expect it to be a complete success, with such a vote back of it. And if it is, the

matter becomes very simple; let every State in the Union speedily adopt prohibition. But if it is not a complete success; if liquor is sold there generally and in considerable quantities, contrary to law, we want to know why liquor is sold there. There is some obscure difficulty here, and there is too much at stake to remain indifferent in this matter, or to be satisfied with generalities.

We propose to probe deeply and unflinchingly until we have located the precise seat of the trouble. We want to make it very plain that the difficulty lies not with the sentiment of the people, but somewhere else; and we want to know by what right any man who enjoys the blessings of free popular government, and professes to believe in democratic institutions where the people themselves, by majorities, exercise the right of rule,—may dare even to intimate that a clear majority of two to one, or of three to one, on any measure of State is not yet large enough to warrant its enactment, or to insure its reasonable enforcement.

D. ADJUDICATION.

(I.)

CHAPTER X.

THE ALLEGED FAILURES OF PROHIBITION.

PROHIBITION has not been a failure; neither has it been an unqualified success. It has worked well enough to convince men that it is not only right, but practicable; that it is the only sufficient and final remedy for the drink evil. To furnish proof of this is but to give what everybody knows, or has no excuse for not knowing. On the other hand, the prohibition policy has hobbled plainly and long enough at once to indicate the presence of a difficulty, and to enable us to locate it. That this difficulty lies elsewhere than in a lack of public sentiment among the people on this question, began to grow apparent at the close of the last chapter.

The hindrance to a complete success of prohibition hitherto has been twofold. It has to do with the *area*, on the one hand, to which prohibition has been applied; and to the *method* on the

other hand, by which it has been applied. These we will discuss in turn.

First—*Area*.

A no-license policy is not likely to be completely or permanently successful in any town when all the surrounding towns sell liquor freely. Such a law, from start to finish, suffers a heavy handicap. It is hard to get such law passed, in the first place. Not that a sufficient number of citizens may not believe in it, or would not like to see liquor banished from their midst, but because they see in advance how the law will be hampered in its operation. They are aware how easy it will be to ship in liquor, or bring it by wagon at night from the next town; and they do not like the thought of the general law-evading and law-breaking that is almost sure to follow. They are aware, too, that to antagonize the saloon right in their midst, where a man has his home and his business, is no holiday matter. A United States marshal can go to a town and close up, and spare not; but for a home citizen to try to do this is neither pleasant nor wholly safe always. Good citizens prefer generally to live in peace, even to

suffering annoyance and wrong. Then, too, the citizen is influenced by trade and tax considerations. It is predicted that if the saloons are closed in this town trade will go to adjoining towns; and this prospect again is not pleasing. And getting no revenue, local taxes will be much higher, it is added. These considerations, any or all, will influence a considerable number to cast their ballot against no-license, while really believing in it, and with no love for the liquor business. This fact must be borne in mind when we consider the extent of local option, or no-license, territory throughout the country,—that large as that area is—in a few States all but entire—the aggregate of local votes, to say nothing of woman's complete exclusion, does not in fact represent the full strength of the sentiment against the liquor trade.

The local option method of dealing with the drink evil works against heavy odds. No community should be expected to settle single-handed a question that has such larger than local bearings. As well try to protect a community against pillage and robbery when robbers' dens infest the woods on all sides just across the town line, as to

keep liquor out of a town when all around they are allowed to sell it. It might be done possibly, but the citizen would begin to question whether it was worth the cost. He would probably conclude to bar the door and take his chances.

What we have said here of local option applies also in a measure to State prohibition, which is but a kind of local option on a larger scale. Prohibition probably never has had a fairer trial than in Iowa under Governor William Larrabee, from 1885 to 1889. The State administration made an earnest effort to enforce the law, yet in the border counties and in the larger interior cities it was more or less openly violated. All the adjoining States made lawful, and were deriving revenue from, that which Iowa was trying to suppress. Not only did the railway communications and the imaginary State border lines offer every facility for smuggling in the contraband article, but when the Chicago and Northwestern Railway, for instance, refused to carry open consignments of liquor into the State, it was sued, and—what is worse,—beaten. The United States Supreme Court, which handed down the final ruling, de-

clared that the act of carrying merchandise from one State into another did not come within the province of State law, but belonged to Federal authority alone, in its control of interstate commerce; and that a railroad, as a common carrier, has no right to discriminate against any commodity which constitutes a proper article of commerce. This decision, rendered in 1888, was followed by another decision, in 1890, known as the "original package" decision, in which the Supreme Court held that liquor thus shipped into prohibition territory could not be seized by the local authorities as long as it remained in the original package, as shipped; and that in such packages it might be sold. The widespread protest which this decision called forth, led Congress to enact some remedial, though insufficient, legislation. The man who now sells liquor in prohibition territory does so at his own risk; but the interstate law still protects the shipment of liquor until actually in the hands of the consignee. In other words, the thief may come within the town limits—under Federal protection; let the constable have a care that he does n't steal!

No; the same power that controls interstate commerce must control the liquor traffic. One would scarcely expect that the prohibition of the sale of any article within its own limits, by a State or town, can be made thoroughly effectual except the importation, the actual bringing in of that article, also, can be made punishable. You say Congress should at once enact a law prohibiting such importation. This Congress certainly should do. A bill to this effect was introduced in the Fifty-seventh Congress, but the liquor power showed its hand at the seat of legislation, and the bill was killed. A similar measure, the Hepburn-Dolliver bill, was brought before the Fifty-eighth Congress, just adjourned. This measure had a strong indorsement of public sentiment, and committee hearings were held; but coming just on the eve of a national political canvass, nothing more was heard of it.

When our Government declares that the liquor question belongs to the States for such settlement as they may severally choose, it should respect them in their full right of such settlement. When a stronger lets a weaker wage combat with

the destroyer single-handed, he should at least give the weaker a fair field. Such law, making the carrying of liquor into prohibition territory punishable, would greatly help the individual States in their uneven contest. It would have made it impossible for the brewers of Dubuque or Davenport, for instance, under the protection of the Federal Government, to ship their liquor across the river into Illinois (this being interstate commerce), and immediately ship it back (this being interstate commerce again) into any part of the State whence it came.

However, such a law, considerably though it would strengthen the hands of the State, is not yet sufficient. The executive machinery of Federal authority is alone adequate properly to enforce a general prohibitory law. Do not the Federal liquor permits taken out everywhere in prohibition territory bear witness to this fact? What do they mean if not this: the liquor-seller is willing to take his chances with the prohibitory law of the State as enforced in his locality, but he will take no such chances with the Federal Government? He will sell—or try to sell—without a State li-

cense, but he will not dare to sell without a Federal permit. If the Government should experience a change of heart, therefore, and use the same vigorous means entirely to suppress liquor-selling which it now employs to collect revenue from it, we should probably hear of fewer repeals of prohibition on the ground that it had failed to prohibit.

If a State is able to maintain its policy of prohibition against such odds, with every neighboring State, may be, against her; with the Federal Government against her; with the wealth and the power of the liquor interests throughout the land incessantly at work to break down the law,—shipping in liquor free, if necessary, as was openly charged in Iowa, to those who will agree to handle it, and even giving it away to those who will drink,—to bring the law into discredit, and to be able to say before the world that prohibition does n't prohibit, and thus bring about its repeal:—if a law, under such conditions, is not severely and even fatally crippled, but can show much good, what may we not expect of it under more favorable conditions!

But aside from the question of practicability

there remains the question of right. If liquor-selling is ruinous and wrong in Kansas, is it beneficent and right in Nebraska or Illinois? Are the effects of strong drink different on the opposite sides of an imaginary geographical line? Does liquor start men on the road to prosperity and heaven in one State, and send them to the penitentiary and the madhouse in the other? If not,—if liquor works everywhere essentially the same works, and if a town has an unquestioned right completely to suppress the liquor business in its midst, on the ground that it is evil, have the people of the next town an equally unquestioned right to permit this same business in their midst, and to throw around it the protection of law? The right to suppress has been amply confirmed, and is now unquestioned; but how about the right to permit? You say that is a matter for each community to decide. No; no. If it were a matter of building a bridge, or paving a street, or operating a light and power plant, or any other business that has a purely local and business character, it would rest properly with the citizens of the community to decide. But not so with far-reaching questions of

morals. No individual or community has any option, for instance, on the Decalogue. If one should ask you, Is it right to steal (provided you are not caught)? you would scarcely answer—pretending that you were liberal and practical, This depends upon the community you are in. Or if you saw a man throwing a carcass into the city's water supply, would it change the character of the act to be told that the people did not relish plain water, and that the doctors and undertakers had agreed that he might do this thing? Or if in a certain place you saw an excited multitude searing a naked body with a hot iron and strangling its life with a rope, would you, on seeing that the victim had swarthy features, and that this occurrence was taking place south of a certain degree of latitude, withhold your judgment and acknowledge that all such acts must be judged according to the sentiment prevailing in each separate community? No; if the local authorities were indifferent, or sanctioned it, you would appeal to the State to overrule local sentiment; such things must not be known within a State. If the State were indifferent, you would appeal to the nation to overrule

the sentiment of the State; such things must not receive sanction within a nation: And if the nation refused to hear, you would raise your voice in the ears of the people in appeal to a higher law than statute or constitution—as men before you have done,—and declare that this thing is an iniquity before God, and must cease; compelling the world to hear.

If therefore theft and murder are wrong, not as localities may decide, but anywhere—everywhere, what shall we say of a public traffic in an article that robs men, first of their purse—trash; then steals away their brains, filches from them their good name, and wrests from them their hope of heaven? Is the right or wrong of this a mere matter of locality? Shall we say that it is crime for a man, anywhere within the broad domain of humanity, to defile the water supply of a people, which produces fever and may result in death, and say of a man who supplies people with a drink that poisons the fountains of virtue, that turns bitter the milk of human kindness, and lays men also in their graves with a worse than physical death; shall we say that it is all right for a man to do this

provided the community said he might (for money), and the State said it did n't care what the towns did?

Or perhaps the fact that a man is willing to take his chances with liquor alters the case,—that he knows about it and agrees to it. Perhaps it is all right for a man to put the bottle to his neighbor's lips, if the latter wants it and finds it agreeable,—is it? Perhaps the circumstance that a man is willing—or a woman—makes it all right for another to debauch him—or her; does it?

The attitude of a large portion of the American people—the position of the Government itself—on the liquor question is precisely the attitude to which Stephen A. Douglas wished to commit this nation on the question of Negro slavery, when he brought forward his doctrine of squatter sovereignty, which cost his party, and almost the nation, its life. Let every community decide for itself; he did not care “whether it was voted up or voted down in the Territories.” To this Lincoln replied: “Any man can say that who does not see anything wrong in slavery, but no man can logically say that who does see a wrong in it; because

no man can logically say he does n't care whether a wrong is voted up or voted down. He may say he does n't care whether an indifferent thing is voted up or voted down, but he must logically have a choice between a right thing and a wrong thing. He contends that whatever community wants slaves has a right to have them. So they have, if it is not wrong. But if it is wrong, he can not say people have a right to do wrong."

With respect to the morals of the liquor traffic our several governmental bodies in America practice a policy of evasion, from first to last. The Federal Government says, Let each State decide as it sees fit; this question belongs to the police power of the States. The State, in turn, when questioned, replies, Let each community decide for itself; our population is so diverse. Towns are granted, consequently, the privilege of "local option." Going, again, to the town or city, we ask, What do you purpose to do with this question of allowing men to engage in the public drink traffic in your midst? We get essentially the same reply, Let the different wards decide what they want; or, It shall rest with the property owners on both sides

of the street in the block where the drink shop is to be opened.

But why stop at this point? No, we must not stop after getting so far. What right has the resident on one side of a street to express an opinion to the resident on the opposite side as to what he should, or should not, have or do on that other side—may not the sentiment on this question be different on the two sides? Why not leave the question with those who live on the same side of the street, in the same block? This would come nearer the ideal of local autonomy. A broad street forms a more real geographical division between people, for instance, than an imaginary line running between States or counties or towns. We have in fact known a town line to run through the middle of a building, part in one township, part in another.

But we must go a step farther. What justice or practical wisdom is there in lumping all the families in a long row of houses, several families perhaps in one house, strangers to one another, with different tastes, habits, views,—what justice to force a uniform policy upon all of these? No

justice, when you come to think of it. Why not then at once avow to rest the question where this principle logically leads us, where sentiment is most homogeneous, where son will swear by his father, and where wife and husband, under stress of outward interference at least, will be of one mind—namely, the family? No special sanctity attaches to a State or town line, city ward, or brick block; but civilized peoples have ever accorded a peculiar sacredness to the family as an institution, and have ever sought to keep its autonomy intact and inviolate.

But there is yet no peace. This principle still lacks its final application. “He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me,” indicates an obedience and a unity higher than that of the family. Once assert the principle of “local option” in a matter of right and wrong, and that principle will know no peace until it rests localized in the individual conscience. Stop short of that—anywhere, and you deny the very principle which you have affirmed. Who is the slayer of kings and rulers—anarchist, we call him—but he who has followed this principle to its logical

conclusion, and has had the courage to carry out his convictions in action? All human government is coercion, he asserts, and wrong. No man can decide for another what is right. Each man's conscience is the tribunal to whose decrees he must give allegiance. And for his logic we condemn this man; for his courage we execute him.

Still he *is* wrong. His premises are false. While the conscience must be obeyed, and while government may not interfere with a man's purely personal beliefs and habits, yet the public acts of a man are a matter of concern to the entire people, and if these become subversive of public peace and good order, the people in their ruling capacity may restrain him from doing evil. Government thus properly becomes, as the Apostle Paul tells us, a terror only to evil doers. It becomes an instrument, not of oppression, but of liberty. The author of the Declaration of Independence had an absolutely correct conception of the function of government when he wrote: "To secure these rights"—life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, etc.—"governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the

governed." To this end the people, in the interests of peace and order and public welfare, overrule not only the "option" of individuals, but the "local option" of bands, sects, societies, of towns, cities, and States even. The people of Utah, for instance, believe religiously in Mormonism, and are said in their heart to cherish polygamy; Colorado believes in free silver, and Texas in free trade; Louisiana late in the day operated a lottery, and South Carolina a little earlier practiced nullification. Did we—or do we—pay deference to the principle of autonomy and self-government, or to the consideration that a uniform policy would be either not right or not expedient? No—yes, to the autonomy and sovereignty of the people as a *nation*, that largest and final unit of action in all matters pertaining to the common weal. To one or the other of these tribunals all questions of morals must be ultimately referred: to the individual conscience—the personal unit, for all purely personal matters; to the national conscience—the social unit, for all questions of far-reaching public concern.

It is just as true of the public commerce in

strong drink as it was, or is, of any of these other questions—as it was of Negro slavery: this nation, on grounds either of expediency or of right, can not remain permanently half under prohibition, and half under license (permission). It will be either all the one or all the other. Either, eventually, every prohibitory statute must be repealed, or else every legalized drink shop must go. There is no other alternative.

Second—*Method.*

The other great hindrance to the complete success of prohibition hitherto lies in the fact that the men who enacted prohibition forgot that no law will enforce itself; that whether or not a law shall prove effective will depend almost entirely upon the machinery and men that are back of it for its enforcement. Fairly to test any law, the same people who enacted it must, in the first place, put a man behind it who is sworn and determined to enforce it; and in the second place, they must stand back of him through the storm and stress of opposition—if there be any—and uphold him in such enforcement, maintaining him in office until the policy is permanently established, or has

at least been thoroughly tested. Then one man can put a thousand to flight.

We will inquire how far these conditions have been present in the history of prohibitory legislation. We will take for this purpose the prohibition policy at its best so far, namely, where it has been made a part of the constitution of a State.

It came about in this way: The temperance forces of the State, after a thorough agitation and a vigorous campaign, have elected a legislature that is pledged to submit the question of a prohibitory constitutional amendment to the people. An amendment is drafted, and the time is fixed for the popular vote. For this purpose a special election may be ordered, as in Iowa (June 27, 1882); or the vote may be taken at the general State or Presidential election, as in Kansas (November 2, 1880), Maine (September 8, 1884), Rhode Island (April 7, 1886), North Dakota and South Dakota (October 1, 1889). Now where the election was held by itself, as in Iowa, the matter was comparatively simple. No national or other State issue was present to obscure the horizon. There were no party interests to serve, and all party feel-

ing was studiously repressed. Non-partisan was the magical word by which prejudice was disarmed and all the temperance sentiment brought together. The canvass was made solely on the merits of the issue. The temperance people for the most part voted for the amendment; all others, solidly against it. The amendment carries. Prohibition, thus enacted by the people without reference to party, now passes out of their hands into party hands—the party in power—for suitable legislation and its enforcement.

Or, to take the instance where the prohibitory amendment is voted on at the regular general election. Here again, the parties in the field do not take issue, probably, on this question, for the chief claim for this constitutional method is that it is strictly non-partisan. It does not make the question a football of party politics. The two things therefore are kept quite separate. The chief concern of the voter is not so much which party will win, as will the amendment carry. The temperance forces, irrespective of party, are working hard that it shall carry; the liquor forces from all parties work equally hard on the other side. The

ballots show a majority for the amendment. Prohibition has carried the day! It now passes into the hands of the party in power for its execution.

But prohibition has not yet as a matter of fact wholly carried the day. It remains yet to be carried *out*. This rests now with the party in power. Did the temperance voters who stood together on the amendment think of this and stand together also to elect a party that was to make the law effective? No, they did not. They voted "Yes" on the amendment, unitedly, because they believed in the suppression of the liquor business; then they broke ranks and voted for the several parties and party candidates according to their convictions upon the tariff, or civil service, or bimetallism, and like questions of national policy. The liquor element did the same, after voting "No" on the amendment. The prohibition policy, established by the people without reference to party, thus passes into party hands for its life or death—that is, for its enforcement. Who is this party in power—what bond has it for the proper fulfillment of its duty?

First of all is to be noted the fact that the

party in power owed its success at the polls to the combined votes of both those who have ardently championed, and those who have as bitterly opposed, the very law which it will be the party's chief task to carry into execution. The party is one or the other of the two parties that have held the reins of office in our land for many years. The one goes back to Thomas Jefferson as its founder; and though it has passed through changes of time and a change of name, it maintains that the succession is unbroken. The other party came into being, like a new continent, with the seismic disturbances of later abolition days, when the pent-up feelings of the people found vent and submerged slavery in a sea of human blood. With the issues settled that brought these parties into being, they have since then taken up various new issues from time to time. But they have never taken up the liquor question, neither of them. Locally they have sometimes given some expression upon it, for or against; but never nationally, except expressly to repudiate it. They have other issues. The question what to do with the public traffic in alcoholic liquors, does not form the dividing line be-

tween them. One's convictions on this question, either way, do not form the basis and bond of party union, nor are they called for as a test of party fealty. These parties are compactly and completely organized, and from national to township elections full separate party candidates are named, and party lines are closely drawn. The national party organization, in each case, sets the pace, and from President to pathmaster the party candidate marches in lock-step. The party shibboleth may be this, or now that; but it has nothing to do with the public traffic in strong drink.

Thus when Maine, in the heated political canvass of 1884, voted on the question of putting prohibition into her constitution at her September State election, Mr. Blaine, though personally convinced of the benefits of prohibition, and on record to that effect, refused to vote either way on the amendment, though he had been urged to lend his influence in its favor. In explanation of his position, Mr. Blaine said in an address that same night at Augusta: "The issue of a temperance amendment to the constitution has been very properly and very rigidly separated from the political con-

test of the State to-day. Many Democrats voted for it, and some Republicans voted against it. The Republican party, by the desire of many leading temperance men, took no action as a party on the amendment. For myself, I decided not to vote at all on the question. I took this position because I am chosen by the Republican party as the representative of national issues, and, by no act of mine shall any question be obtruded into the national campaign which belongs properly to the domain of State politics." That is to say, the liquor question has no place in a national campaign; it belongs to State politics, and in the State it is very rigidly and very properly separated from party issues and party lines.

It is into the hands of a party thus constituted and elected on other issues, which has never taken a well defined position on the drink question, and has within its ranks both a temperance and a liquor element, that the prohibition policy is thrust for its life. A swaddled infant has been laid in the party's lap, to call forth the mingled feigned love, fear, and aversion of an irregular parentage. Will the party look faithfully after the law? It will

not do it effectually if it can; it can not do it effectually if it will. The party will do one of three things, any of which will turn out rather adversely for the cause of temperance.

1. The party will try to conciliate both its temperance and its liquor constituents, endeavoring to retain the favor and support of both by not too seriously offending either. This is obviously the first recourse. Any party will be slow to hazard its life unnecessarily on an extraneous issue like temperance. If it is true of an individual that self-preservation is nature's first law, it is more true of an established political party. An individual, under great stress of soul, may sometimes forget considerations of safety and even court death; but a political party never. It is true that in the beginning a party is sometimes launched forth upon some wave of moral impulse, but after it becomes of age and begins to feel the exhilaration of success, of applause and emolument, its aim becomes less ethical, and its spirit less heroic. It comes to be moved more and more by the one consideration—success, that is, victory at the polls. In the meantime it develops, by specialization, a

set of men—the practical or professional politicians, office-holders, and office-seekers—whose special work it is to emphasize this necessity of success, and to steer the party craft intact through the breakers of discontent and popular caprice, which ever and again threaten it with disruption and defeat. Expediency rather than right becomes the rule of party action. Fidelity of its oath of office counts for something, of course, but the interests of party are supreme.

In its relation to the prohibitory law, therefore, the party will adopt a conservative attitude just as far as this is possible. The situation is serious, for the party owes its success to the combined votes of those who have ardently favored, and those who have determinedly opposed, the very policy of prohibition which the party's officials have now taken a solemn oath to enforce. The law will not be enforced—very rigidly. In localities where temperance sentiment is strong, the enforcement, under local pressure and by local officials, will be more stringent. In other localities, where sentiment is less pronounced and pressure from the liquor element is felt, the law will

be more or less openly violated. The party will adopt no general, uniform policy of enforcement the State over, as it not only has a right to do, but is in duty bound to do if local officials fail of their duty, or need re-enforcement. In taking this attitude the party will please most and offend the fewest among its own number. It will impress upon the temperance people, those within the party at least, that it is making every reasonable effort to enforce the law as far as sentiment will permit. And party loyalty is strong enough on this side to make such course reasonably safe, nothing less than undisguised party perfidy or open insult being likely to cause these to break away. On the other hand, the liquor and anti-prohibition elements within the party will content themselves with the furthest concessions which may reasonably be expected, the situation being bad at the best.

This appears to have been the situation, for instance, in Kansas, which led to the Carrie Nation joint-smashing crusade, of recent, terrible memory. It has been the policy, more or less, at some time or other, in every State that has had, or has, prohibition. It is from this condition of things that

much of what we hear of the failure of prohibition originates. That there is a failure somewhere here—this appears manifest.

2. The party in office, again, after the people have declared for prohibition, may secretly yield so far to the influence of the liquor interests by refusing, in its legislative capacity, to enact measures sufficient to carry prohibition into effect, or refusing in its executive capacity, to try reasonably to enforce such measures as it has enacted, that the very people who supported the amendment will now, in sad disgust at the law's failure, vote for its repeal.

This was the case, for instance, in Rhode Island under the short constitutional prohibition régime, from 1886 to 1889. The people, aroused at the dictation of the liquor power in State politics, and at the disregard by the party in power for the open violation of the very moderate restriction laws throughout the State, voted by more than the required three-fifths majority for constitutional prohibition. Under the double system, again, of voting at such time—voting now on the amendment, now for a national party organization

—a system under which the right hand knows not what the left doeth, the prohibition policy was entrusted for its enforcement to the self-same party at whose subservience to the liquor interests the people had just protested. The leopard did not—perhaps could not—change his spots. The party remained subservient to the liquor interests still. The legislative measures enacted to make prohibition effective were inadequate. Amendments to these measures were promised in return for temperance support, but never materialized. The State and local officials, who had sworn to administer the laws of the commonwealth honestly and impartially, were largely indifferent to open violations of the prohibitory law,—officials, to quote the attorney-general of the State, that could have made the law affective “had they shown any honest disposition to respect their oaths of office.” The chief party journals, notably the *Providence Journal*, which fought prohibition from the beginning, attributed these violations to the inherent weakness of the prohibition policy, rather than where it belonged, to inherent weakness in the party’s officials.

Thus after three years of violation and open

abuse, at the very time when temperance people were looking for more effective legislation, in accordance with recent party pledges, and for a more determined effort at enforcement, the legislature, under the liquor lobby's influence passed a vote to submit the amendment to the people for repeal. And by practically cutting off public discussion in fixing the date for the popular vote at twenty days; by specially changing and putting off the time at which a ballot reform act was to go into effect until after that date; by misrepresentation and laying the blame all on the law; by money, and by the honest conviction of large numbers of good men that it "can't be done," the amendment was repealed. Which was true: it can't be done—that way.

3. The party in power, on the other hand, may seek no favor and tolerate no complicity with the liquor interests, but with a respect unto its oath of office seek an honest and determined enforcement of the prohibitory law. It may not be able to do this completely, owing to the limitations, territorial and other, imposed upon the party from without and from within, yet reasonably and suffi-

ciently well to give all encouragement to the friends of temperance. The prohibition policy, from its achievement of good and its promise of yet greater good as thus administered, may have every prospect of permanence and of offering a last glad solution of the whole vexed drink question—and the next election will come around. At that election this will take place: the temperance votes of the State will, as usual, be divided among the several parties as an expression upon national party issues, while the liquor interests, instead of voting dividedly as before, will now, with their business-above-party policy, throw their united support against the party in power, and defeat it.

From the time when the first prohibition law was enacted, that of Maine, in 1851, over which the Democratic party in that State went to pieces, up to the present time, wherever the party officials have taken their oaths of office seriously, this has been the result. The most conspicuous instance of this is the experience in Iowa. When under the four years' governorship of William Larrabee, a sincere champion of prohibition from the time that he saw its fruits, the breweries of the State

had been turned into oatmeal mills and the distilleries into canning factories; when legitimate trade had everywhere expanded, and the only business that had been ruined was the saloon business; when the State had paid off its last cent of bonded indebtedness, and its bank deposits had increased to exceed those of Illinois, both in number and in amount; when, next to Kansas, she ranked first in the Union in the number of children, in proportion to the population, attending school; when criminal business and expenses had been reduced from thirty to seventy-five per cent, and the jails in many counties were for the first time entirely empty, and there were fewer tramps and paupers in the State than ever before; when Governor Larrabee had but recently declared that the law was growing steadily in public favor, that prohibition was "beyond doubt the settled policy of Iowa," and would be ratified, were it submitted to a vote of the people, by an overwhelming majority "of from sixty to eighty thousand,"—it was then that the party through whom these things had been wrought, a party which in the Presidential election the year before had received a plurality

of thirty-two thousand votes, was now, in the State election of 1889, defeated by a plurality of nearly seven thousand votes. The Republican party was defeated by a former member of that party, Horace Boies, an opponent of prohibition, who had left his party when it first took up this question, and now as the nominee of the Democratic party drew the liquor and anti-prohibition vote to his side. After four years of inaction and repudiation, during his incumbency, when the law had been put to an almost open shame, public sentiment had been sufficiently numbed to acquiesce in the enactment, by the legislature of 1894, of the Martin or "mulet" law, whereby saloons are permitted, or statedly "fined," in cities and towns where a specified majority desire them.

Thus did prohibition "fail" in Iowa.

While this is all plain enough, still, because we have here a somewhat crucial instance, we will go into the matter a little more in detail. Strictly speaking, Iowa has never been under constitutional prohibition; yet practically the same conditions have prevailed, except that the virtual abrogation of prohibition by the enactment of the mulet law

was accomplished by the legislature without the sanction of a popular vote. No sooner had the people, in 1882, declared for prohibition by a substantial majority, when the Supreme Court, by majority decision, pronounced the vote unconstitutional on grounds of a technicality, that hole of offense through which many a precious interest of society has been lost. Three words appeared in the text of the amendment as submitted to the people that were not found in the legislative journal as kept by the clerk of the House. Though the substance of the law was not changed in the least, still the submission was declared irregular, and the vote null and void. These jots and tittles of the law mean more to the judicial than they do to the executive branch of our Government.

The temperance people were determined, however, not to lose the fruits of victory. A mass State convention of all the temperance elements was held, regardless of party, and the declaration was sent forth that the party in power would be held responsible for any failure to carry out the expressed desire of the large majority of the people on this question. In response to this senti-

ment the next legislature (Republican) passed a statutory prohibition law, which went into effect July 4, 1884. This came near undoing the party. There was an abundance of temperance sentiment behind prohibition in the State, but it was not all behind this particular party that was now charged to enforce it. The Republican party had a large majority, doubtless, that supported prohibition; but it also had an integral element that opposed it, and a house divided against itself can not stand—very long.

Had the Republican party been the only party in the field, the better elements within it would doubtless have triumphed, and prohibition have been retained. But with another party anxious to get into the saddle, of almost equal strength, and ready to take any advantage of its opponent's predicament,—a party to which its anti-prohibition and malcontent elements may decamp, a straight out-and-out policy on this question could not but be hazardous. With the election of 1889 the calamity came, as we have seen. Had the temperance voters been united in the Republican party, or in any party, or under no party name.

this would not have happened. But they were busy arguing earnestly with one another over national party questions, such as who was the greater man, Jefferson or Lincoln, Andrew Jackson or Grant. While they were deciding this, the liquor interests decided what should be done with prohibition.

From this experience party leaders were to learn wisdom. When one is felled by an unexpected blow, the first inquiry on recovering the senses is, whence came it? Being out of office, the next step with the politician is to get back in. This he does, never by enlightening the human mind and removing prejudice in appeal to the higher ideals of citizenship, but by taking a studied advantage of these very weaknesses for personal or party ends. The course to be pursued now became plain. The party must rid itself of the incubus of prohibition. Whether the people throughout the State, if they could have expressed themselves by non-partisan ballot on this question, would have still cast a majority for prohibition—"of from sixty to eighty thousand," as Governor Larrabee had declared,—this was little to the

point. The fact was, the Republican party had championed this issue, with all the hazard which that involved, and the people had not sustained *it*. Besides the party interests in the State, national party interests also demanded the abandoning of prohibition. The party in Iowa was anxious to push forward its most illustrious son for the honors of the Presidency, and with a party in his own State behind him, stoutly committed to prohibition, his handicap in the nation at large would likely prove too considerable.

Pursuant to new plans, therefore, a bill providing for local option was introduced in the legislature, in 1892, a measure which, though it had the support of the party press, was defeated. A more definite step was taken the following year to abandon prohibition. The party at its State convention that year declared as follows: "Resolved, That prohibition is no test of Republicanism. That the General Assembly has given to the State a prohibitory law as strong as has ever been enacted by any government. That, like all criminal statutes, its retention, modification, or repeal, must be determined by the General Assembly, elected by and

in sympathy with the people, and to them is relegated the subject, to take such action as they deem just and best in the matter; to maintain the present law in those portions of the State where it is now or can be made efficient, and give to other localities such methods of controlling and regulating the liquor traffic as will serve the cause of temperance and morality."

On this platform the Republican party again came into possession of its birthright—the State administration. In accordance with this position of the party platform, the mulct law was passed the following year, in 1894, and signed by the Republican governor. Under this policy the elements that temporarily left the party have come back, and the party has recently carried its sixth consecutive election. It is significant of the change of political fortunes and favors, that the present incumbent of the executive office, Mr. A. B. Cummins, elected in 1901, and re-elected in 1903, should be the very one who in 1889 led the anti-prohibition faction out of the Republican party, and helped to defeat it.

Notwithstanding these known, or ascertainable

facts, there are those who have persistently attributed the defeat of prohibition in Iowa to the prohibition or "third" party. This minority party has indeed served as a convenient scapegoat for the sins of many. During those years when prohibition was really at stake in Iowa, the "third" party exerted no appreciable influence, casting only a scattering vote. Its largest vote was cast before the question had ever been generally thought of as an issue in State politics, namely in 1877, when the Prohibition party polled 10,545 votes. It was this considerable vote, indeed, together with the pressure from the temperance elements within the Republican party, that first made prohibition an issue. When the Republican party in 1879 declared its willingness to submit the temperance question to the people, the "third" party vote fell to 3,258. In 1885, when the Republican party had actually taken up the issue, the "third" party vote fell to 1,405. In 1887, when the Republican party showed its good faith by renominating Governor Larrabee, only 309 ballots went to a separate "third" party ticket, from the entire State. In 1889, when the Republican defeat came, the

“third” party vote aggregated 1,358. Inasmuch as the Republican party was beaten by a plurality of 6,523 in this election, it could not have won even if it had received the entire “third” party vote, assuming that this entire vote belonged to it of right. Again, in 1891, when the Republican party was still committed to prohibition, in spite of defection, only 915 voted an independent, or “third” party ticket. In 1893, however, when the Republican party definitely abandoned prohibition, and the struggle was practically over, 10,349 votes were again cast for the Prohibition, or “third party. If now the 1,358 “third” party votes in 1889, and the 915 votes in 1891, defeated the Republican party in each case, why did not the 10,349 “third” party votes in 1893 also defeat it?

Thus have the temperance people in many States asked for bread, and they have received—strong drink. They asked, but they asked amiss, and therefore received not. They had the correct principle, but their methods were bungling. The heart was right, but the head was not clear.

In all these reversals of the policy of prohibi-

tion, whether constitutional or statutory simply, it should be borne in mind that with the exception of Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Vermont, prohibition has never yet been repealed by the people themselves. The manner of repeal in Rhode Island has already been noted. In South Dakota, through the liberal use of money in the legislature by the brewing and liquor interests outside the State, the amendment was first resubmitted to the people, and by the colonization of large numbers of voters from across the State line,—a thing made possible under the loose registration laws of the State—a small majority was secured for repeal, in 1897. In Vermont, after fifty-one years of unbroken prohibition, with the surrounding States all making and selling liquor, and seeking to break down the law, in a popular referendum, in February, 1903, the people voted for local option by a majority of about 1,200 in a total vote of 60,000.

Official collusion and party incapacity have crippled prohibition laws; legislatures, yielding to corruption or to party expediency, have repealed them; governors have vetoed, courts have scrutinized and declared void, and our great Govern-

ment, through it all, has spoken peace to the saloon; but the honest sentiment of the people themselves, as shown in the continued support they have given to prohibition with all its handicap, and as seen in the constantly growing area under local option—uneven though that contest is,—these, with many other incontestible proofs, show that conviction has never been so deep or widespread as it is to-day, that the dramshop and the entire commerce in strong drink must be suppressed.

(II.)

CHAPTER XI.

THE LESSONS OF EXPERIENCE: A TEMPERANCE CONSTITUENCY.

BUT will the people ever succeed in establishing prohibition, and do away with drinking entirely, do you think?"

Omniscience alone could answer that. Prediction is hazardous, and may become fatuous. No man can say yes or no to this, of knowledge; for we deal here not with an objective, demonstrable truth, but with that somewhat uncertain factor, human impulses and the human will. That man is better off, every way, without the use of strong drink, and that he ought therefore of reason not to drink, this is readily demonstrable. That society—man in the aggregate—would be better off, every way, without the trade of liquor-selling, this too can scarcely be seriously questioned. But to induce the tippling man actually to leave his cup; to prevail upon the aggregation of men, with their

diverse prejudices and self-interests, actually to address themselves to putting this offense out of their way,—this is a somewhat different matter. Whether a man will say yes or no to this, will depend largely upon his philosophy and view-point of life. To say that these things will be accomplished, resolves itself into a matter of faith in God and in human nature; a faith, namely, that in the free field of self-government, whether personal or political, individual or social, the better elements in man will in the long run predominate; that he will both discern and do that which is right and good. To ridicule these things, therefore, as there are always those who do, clinching it with a lofty, laconic “Never!” as though they possessed some superior knowledge of the world and of men, indicates nothing superior whatever. It does not speak to the credit of anybody.

The fact that in every State and community of the nation the moral forces have repeatedly and with increasing energy thrown themselves into this great conflict, and have failed of complete success only, not so much from a lack of zeal and determination as from a lack of clear knowledge,—the

fact that the temperance reformation over the country at large lacks yet of being accomplished chiefly because men have hitherto not been able to see clearly how it could be done, or because they are yet laboring under the delusion of gain,—these things point strongly to but one ultimate outcome. And when the temperance people see clearly that it can be done, and how; when the commercial citizen, Esau's child, awakens to a knowledge of the fact that not only will a town and a State be able to meet its expenses without the saloon, but that when the vast wealth which is now worse than wasted on liquor shall be turned aside to the building of roads, and into the legitimate lines of trade, towns and communities will for the first time begin to enjoy real prosperity; when the drinker begins to realize that a man will not die even if deprived of his grog; and the drink-seller, increasingly aware that the Church, the school, and every wife and mother are against his business, and organizations of labor, of industry and insurance, fraternal orders—everybody, even his own conscience,—when the drink-seller begins to see that there are abundant other occupations at which he

may earn a living—an unquestioned, respectable living, and take his place again in society, with his family,—then, then the end of the long conflict will have been brought near.

The much-mentioned “failures” of prohibition throw a flood of light upon the intricacies of this question. They are of more value than many theories. They are an indictment which falls where those who bring it forth have least foreseen. The liquor man who cries “failure” is hurling a boomerang that comes back to his own law-defying, intimidating, corrupting self, who is at bottom the whole cause of such failure; who is law-abiding only when the law is to his liking; who affirms the principle of majority rule so long as it permits him to inflict himself upon the community, but denies it when it says that such infliction shall cease. As long as the temperance people are in the minority they must suffer him; when they have become a majority they must still suffer him.

The temperance man, on the other hand, who speaks of failure, condemns the very method which he has advocated as ideal and sufficient to achieve the suppression of the drink trade. Moreover, he

confesses to his own inconsistency. He went forth under the banner of non-partisanship to conquer, and abandoned that standard in the very crisis of the fight. He followed the non-partisan method only long enough to say that he wanted prohibition; all the rest was left in party hands. He was so zealous that the temperance question should not be made the football of party politics, yet it was his own hands that unwittingly rolled it into the party arena. Whatever neglect and abuse prohibition has suffered it has received *there*.

The situation then is this: party machinery defeating popular sentiment and popular will, either by not doing the work of enforcement well enough, or by doing it well enough and going to pieces. The drink question may have been safe enough in party hands fifty years ago, but it is not so now. An entirely different condition confronts us. The liquor business, under the discipline of heavy taxation, has become solidly organized, strong, keen, resourceful, and jealous for its preservation. Its sphere of operation is politics, and behind the party form of government it finds an impregnable bulwark. It has for many years

been the most active and dominant single factor in our political life. It is a force which every office-seeker has felt, and every aspirant to office must reckon with. To antagonize it openly means a heavy handicap for any man in the political race. This is true not only of the individual, but of the party as well, as every wise party leader knows. Ethics is thus apt to be sacrificed to expediency, personal honor to the itch for office. Experience in public life seems to corroborate the somewhat cynical reflection of the late Senator John J. Ingalls, when he said of the relation of ethics to politics, that the party that takes for its rule the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount may retain, after election, the approval of conscience, but that the other side will get about everything else.

But, with reference to this question, it will be contended, is not the overwhelming temperance sentiment of the country entitled to respect? It certainly is. It is not considerations of respect, however, that determine the policy of a political party. It is fear and hope rather, motives of prudence, which govern party action. It is this motive, when thrown into the scales of political wis-

dom, that inclines the beam toward the interests of liquor. Thus, while our parties have a large temperance constituency which they would like not to offend, they have also a large liquor constituency which they dare not offend. For if the party should take a strong and unequivocal stand on the side of temperance, its liquor element would quickly and without compunction leave it and defeat it. If on the other hand, the party maintains conciliatory and friendly relations with the liquor interests, its temperance element will still remain with it, the party leaders focusing the mind upon other things; and so, with the support of both, in a contest where all mention of the troublesome question is carefully avoided, the party wins. Consequently when a liquor man and a temperance man vote for the same party candidate, the former assured that his business will not be molested, and the latter believing and hoping that it will be, it is the latter who is usually disappointed.

But it does not seem possible that the children of this world should be so much and constantly wiser than the children of light, you say. This observation has at least the corroborative testimony

of age. It should be said, however, that such advantage in the instance of the drink struggle has not been gained in wholly open and honorable combat. It has been won by a subterfuge movement. Sin first deceives, then slays. Thus, while our political parties maintain a conciliatory policy toward the liquor vote, in order not to lose its support, they would hardly have the effrontery to come before the temperance people and make appeal for their vote also, on the basis of *this* attitude. It is by persuading the temperance vote that ✓ this is of but small consequence either way just at this juncture, that temperance should not be mixed up with politics; that the urgent question calling for decision is, shall our commercial integrity be preserved, our national honor vindicated, and national calamity be averted,—it is by diverting the mind to such absorbing counter interests that the party pilots, having made peace with the liquor interests, are able also to win the enthusiastic support of the temperance vote, and steer clear of the breakers of revolt.

Thus while the liquor voter knows no other issue in a political canvass until his own is safe,

the temperance voter knows no drink issue until all others are safe.

Thus whichever party wins, the liquor man lands on top.

Thus all efforts to induce our political parties to give recognition to the temperance question in their platforms have been futile and vain.

Thus while in every State, every county, city, and village where men have labored to be rid of the saloon, the very difficulties and failures of enforcement have been so many formal appeals to the nation's capital for relief, this question is waiting to-day, with its cumulative evidence, before this final court of adjudication, and by perpetual postponement is denied a hearing.

The fact that there are two fairly balanced parties in the nation, who by virtue of their persistent championship of other issues have divided the temperance sentiment of the country between them, has enabled the liquor interests to maintain an effectual balance of power between them on the drink question. Neither party will recognize this question, rid itself entirely of its liquor contingent and be willing to suffer defeat, if need be for a

season, until it shall have gathered to its standard the moral forces of the nation, and carried this reform to its consummation.

The question must be taken out of the sphere of partisan politics. The method which wrought such majorities for prohibition in Kansas, Iowa, Maine, Rhode Island, and the Dakotas, and piled up so large a vote in a dozen other States, suggests to us the correct method of procedure. It is the non-partisan method, as it has been named, with this difference, that it shall now be consistently employed to the end. The crippling and partial failure of prohibition in these States has not been due to the non-partisan method, but to the abandonment of that method the moment prohibition had been declared for. To carry out a public policy requires not alone the enactment of a law, but the faithful execution also of that law, until its benefits shall have become so manifest and generally accepted that serious opposition to it will cease. Especially is this true of prohibition, which encounters difficulties unknown to other laws. Now in these States the non-partisan method did not even extend to the framing of the law, still less

to its enforcement. All these things were left to regular party machinery, with such means and disposition as were found at hand. The non-partisan method went so far as to say, simply, that the people wanted such a law. But it did enable the people to find their voice on this question, and to speak so clearly as to be heard above the din of political strife. Herein lies the promise of this method. Only something more is necessary than going to the polls and recording a wish. To a self-governing people is given the privilege and power to carry this wish into effect.

The same people, therefore, who in a momentary forgetfulness of party feeling have said that they wanted a prohibition law, must keep in their own hands also the actual framing of such a law, and themselves enforce it. Under our form of government this is done through chosen representatives. To this end all those who have cast their votes together, regardless of party, for prohibition, must also cast their ballots together for certain men of their own number—legislators—who will adequately enact this policy into law; and again cast their ballots together for certain other men

of their own number—executive officials—who will effectually carry this law into execution. This is not yet enough. These voters must for a time at least remain together—they must form a *constituency*—to uphold their representatives in office, so that these latter, after having faithfully done their work, shall not be subtly dislodged from office by the enemy, but shall be retained in power until the storm and stress is over, and the law shall have become a part of the established policy of the commonwealth.

Portland, Maine, has recently offered a suggestive experiment in law enforcement. Maine has a strong, faultless prohibition law, but the executive officials to whom it has been entrusted have not always been above suspicion. Not a few of them here, as elsewhere, have been observed after their term of office to build large houses and to live comfortably ever afterwards. The temperance people of Cumberland County, in the fall of 1900, having become exercised over the condition of affairs, forgot their party affiliations for a moment and united on Rev. Samuel F. Pearson, a Methodist mission worker in Portland, for the

office of sheriff. He had avowed that if elected he would enforce prohibition and bring every law-breaker to justice; and the people believed him. The records show that he kept his promise. Here in Maine's largest city, a short distance only from the New Hampshire line where the manufacture of liquor is made lawful, and from Massachusetts where both the making and selling of strong drink are a source of large revenue to the State,—in this seaport city and railroad center with such transportation facilities by land and water, here this determined man, with several doughty deputies, wrought such works that his name went out to the ends of the nation. Every ingenious or desperate device, such as is known only to criminals, was repeatedly foiled, and the last persistent, boasting, defying law-breaker gave up the fight in despair. The saloon closed up business in Portland, and in Cumberland County; the city gained in peace and order, and according to the report of the mayor, realized a considerable saving in its poor account.

The Pearson régime in Portland showed two things: (1) what temperance voters can do when they get together to secure the right kind of man

for office; and (2) what such man can do to galvanize a "dead" law into life, and make it a terror to the evil-doer and an instrument of blessing to the community. One thing only remained to be demonstrated, prevented by the sudden death of Mr. Pearson shortly before his term expired: would the temperance voters of Cumberland County have stood by Mr. Pearson in the next election?

No prohibition statute can be enforced permanently without a prohibition constituency. Herein is revealed the weakness of having the representative of a party (a part) carry out what the people (a whole) have decreed. No party we have yet had has been able to furnish safe backing for an official to do his duty with respect to prohibition. Many an executive official, from governor and State's attorney to town constable, has honestly tried to enforce such laws. Wise political managers shook their heads and warned them to relax their zeal, that he was hurting party interests and himself. Perhaps he gave heed, with the result we all know. Perhaps he did not, with the result that the morning after the next election he was found

outside the battlements—dead. His own party deserts him, or if it does cling to him both go down to defeat. There is but small encouragement for an official to do his full, toilsome duty when he knows that it will more than likely only cost him his place, and that his work will only be undone. Over and over again has this taken place, and the apparent apathy or recession in temperance interest in many communities is due to this circumstance more than to any other. The people have become weary in well-doing. They do not know what to do.

Form a temperance constituency!

Had the temperance people of Iowa, for instance, who in 1882 voted for prohibition by thirty thousand majority, *stood together* to elect men who were to enact suitable legislation, and men to enforce such legislation; supporting in national campaigns such party candidates as they might severally choose, but knowing in each succeeding State election no issue but the suppression of the dramshop, stone deaf to every party name, appeal, or device to separate them,—had the temperance voters with their safe majority *remained together*

on this issue and repeatedly returned to office those who had been faithful in the law's enforcement, until men had forgotten their thirst, and a generation grown up who had never known it, then there would have been no waning and loss of majorities, no Governor Boies, no mullet law, no "failure" of prohibition.

Let us now apply these principles on a national scale, as we must. The cry of the campaign must be, On to Washington! With the rebel dislodged here, the Appomattox of this conflict will speedily follow, and the slave be set free. But how shall we get to Washington? In the States the question was squarely submitted to the voters, and they had a fair chance at it. The temperance people made such a loud stir that the legislature heard and gave heed, and said, Here's the question; vote on it. But how shall we get this question before the people of the nation for a vote? There has been no lack of stir, of agitation and appeal. The Churches in particular, representing a voting strength of several million, and a moral strength of millions more, declare peremptorily at every ecclesiastical convention that the sanction of the drink

traffic is a national infamy, and must not be tolerated. Our national parties have been importuned that they declare in favor of submitting the drink question to the people,—a very reasonable request, as Senator Blair used to insist. The members of Congress have been labored with, and resolutions have been introduced into Congress proposing a prohibitory amendment to the Constitution, and submitting it to the people for a vote. It has all been in vain.

The people must clearly take the initiative. It is not so difficult. From every pulpit and ecclesiastical convention—where sober truth is uttered, if anywhere—word has gone out that the disposal of this question is of more vital concern to the interests of the Christian Church and of humanity than is any other question within sight to-day. And the citizen, as he looks about him and sees things as they occur in his own community, and everywhere, will honestly respond deep in his own heart, “It is true; it is true; it is surely true.” Now, a thing so spoken must not be lightly forgotten. It must not be forgotten when the vanities and allurements of the world would weave

about us their magic spell. When some political Simon Magus, with pageant of trumpetry and illumination, would work some charm upon the multitude with the mighty names of Jefferson, or Lincoln, men must not childlike be carried away and forget *this*. Jefferson and Lincoln—great men—are dead. This that has been declared from pulpit and in solemn assembly and in the ears of the people everywhere, by voice of mouth and of conscience, before the political pageant came in sight, must not be forgotten now, on election morning. Declarations, denunciations, resolutions, as an afterthought when the voting has been done, have missed the time for action. The voter's booth is the citizen's confessional, where the sins of society must be openly recalled and confessed. Not prayers, nor tears, nor declarations, but votes are the immediate agency that determines a public policy. Public servants are hopelessly deaf to all sound except as it is spoken through the ear-trumpet, the voter's urn.

On election morning then, at the ballot-box, the temperance voters must take the initiative. They must resolve, "We have declared this; we

believe it now; our action to-day shall not belie our word." If the professional party retainer comes around and asks, "And all other issues must wait till this one is settled?" they will reply, "This issue shall not wait until all others are settled." If he insists that there are other questions that demand attention, they will insist that the agitation and labors of a hundred years have given the drink question a well-earned right of precedence. If temperance voters can agree on other questions, well and good; but they must not disagree on this one question. In every assembly district and every congressional district they must get together. No man must receive their vote on the basis of his party affiliations, but solely because he stands squarely committed on the temperance question. Devotion to this principle must be the bond of union between them." Standing thus together in each congressional district, the temperance forces will insist that only such representatives are sent to Washington as are pledged to vote for the submission of a prohibitory amendment to the people. They will stand together in every State assembly and senatorial district, to

send only men to the State legislature who will vote for a United States Senator that is likewise committed. When the senators and representatives in congress, so elected, have a two-thirds majority, they will frame a prohibitory amendment to the Constitution and submit it to the legislatures of the several States. Here the temperance forces must have stood together, and from each district send only such men to the legislature who will now be ready to vote favorably upon the amendment. When the amendment has been ratified by the legislatures in three-fourths of the States, it becomes a part of the fundamental law of the land.

It is a question whether Congress has not the power under the Constitution, without a specific amendment, to enact a general prohibitory law. It is true that hitherto the regulation, or disposal, of the drink traffic has been considered as belonging to the police function of the States. All powers not expressly delegated to Congress are reserved to the States and to the people; and the power to suppress the liquor traffic has not been thus expressly delegated to Congress. However, it is a question whether this matter is not so far

removed from having a merely local aspect, affecting as it does our national life and the whole people so vitally, and touching so closely the very functions of government itself, that, in the larger interpretation of the Constitution, it would not properly come within the scope of Congressional action. If the United States Supreme Court, which interprets the Constitution both in its letter and spirit, has said that to sell intoxicating liquor is not an inherent right in a citizen either of a State or of the United States; and if it is true, as the same court further declares, that the statistics of every State show a greater amount of crime and misery attributable to the use of the liquor obtained at these saloons than to any other one source; and that legislatures have no right to barter away the health and morals of a people, the people themselves having no right to do it (*i. e.*, to *vote* it),—with this understanding of facts and this interpretation of the Constitution, it is a question indeed whether every license or permissive law, which allows this trade to go on, should not itself be adjudged unconstitutional. It would seem that there could be little doubt that a government which

was established "to insure domestic tranquillity, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," has not already the implied constitutional power to suppress a public business so subversive of these ends. Over in Canada, in 1895, the Canadian Supreme Court declared that the power to suppress the liquor trade in all its phases belongs exclusively to the Dominion, a decision that was affirmed by the Imperial Privy Council, upon appeal, in 1896. The court held that all local option laws in the provinces were valid, however. If this is a question for national action in Canada, why not also in the United States?

The Federal Government does not now, as a matter of fact, respect the prerogative of the States to deal with this question; for after a State has outlawed the liquor trade, the Government in the exercise of its interstate commerce control will still allow liquor to be shipped in, and will collect revenue from every illicit vender in the State, as the price of peace. If the State has sovereign authority over this particular form of industry, then Uncle Sam, whom we like to think of highly, be-

comes in this instance nothing less than a *particeps criminis*. The shrewd, wizened countenance, the half-closed eyes, the cigar—as our newspaper artists conceive of him—these, in that case, become him well. And if the Government is not bound to respect the prohibition policy of a State, is it any more bound to respect the license policy of another State? Has not a government which exercises the prerogative to single out and tax a business heavily, and upon the non-payment of the tax, to suppress it, has it not also the power, under the same authority, to abate the business when it has manifestly become an intolerable nuisance? An amendment to the Constitution will, at any rate, remove any possibility of quibble, and will make prohibition not only judicially safe, but also reasonably safe against repeal.

With the amendment secured by the means we have indicated, a great work yet remains. Suitable and adequate measures must be enacted by Congress to carry the provisions of the amendment into effect. This needs to be well done. For this purpose the temperance voters who stood together on the amendment must still stand together

and see that the right men are kept in Congress for this work. The law now having been made, and well made we will say, the next matter to consider will be the executive force to carry it into effect. Here the temperance voters must stand together in every voting precinct in the country and agree only upon such men, from President to constable, who are squarely committed to prohibition. No other issue or consideration must divide them. With the mighty Federal executive enginery now in the hands of the sworn friends of temperance, the prohibition policy will for the first time have what one might call a fair trial, as fair, for instance, as the financial policies of our Government have had.

But the work is not yet done. Beware the ides of November! In the tumult of the next election there will be some political knifing. The good citizen must not be unprepared. The temperance voters who have stood together so well may not yet separate and turn to other issues. They must now form a temperance *constituency* and stand back of the executive, and retain him, or one like him, in office. They must, as a temper-

ance constituency, stand back of the individual members of Congress and retain them, or those like them, in office, lest measures be passed weakening prohibition, or the entire question be again unexpectedly submitted to the people before the policy has been fairly tried.

During these years the temperance forces must stand together solidly on this one issue. They must refuse to give recognition to any other question that might divide them. As the liquor interests have for many years been a political unit as touching their business, holding all other interests as secondary, so the temperance interests must be a political unit as touching *their* business, holding all other considerations as secondary. The contention that other questions are too important thus to wait upon this one, is little to the point, frequently as it is heard. It does not follow that all other questions would have to wait, that nothing would be done during these years but to sit by and watch the workings of the prohibition law. Congress does many things at a single sitting. It is not a question of doing only one thing when a hundred are to be done, but of doing a particular

thing—long postponed—first, then attending to other business equally well, perhaps better. A legislative body that can dispose of the drink question will be able to cope, with reasonable assurance, with other questions that properly come before it. This is then the difference: when the temperance voter makes a party name the condition of his ballot, the party may win and certain things be done, but it will not be the drink question that will be settled; when the temperance voter, on the other hand, makes the temperance principle the condition of his ballot, entirely disentangled from party influence, his candidate, too, will win; other things, too, will be done, *and the drink question will be settled.* On wholly practical grounds, therefore, will the temperance forces be justified in standing solidly together and making the temperance principle instead of a party name the basis of union in political action. The country will hardly go to ruin. The good Lord takes care of us now; He will not take less care of a people that seek first His righteousness.

Such concerted, consistent action in every place, all over the nation by the friends of tem-

perance everywhere, will require organization. This mass of voters must become a body, or it will go to pieces. Loyalty to one supreme principle must constitute its cohesive power. There must be intercommunication, mutual information, mutual confidence. There must be faithful leadership and wise counsel. Funds must be collected and properly applied. Literature must be prepared and distributed, and many forms of specialized work must be done. Without organization on a temperance basis there can not be unity of action in securing temperance results.

Then, after a period of thorough enforcement, secured and maintained by such methods, when the saloon, like a plague spot, shall have been wiped from every community; when the vast sums now spent annually for liquor shall go into channels of productive industry,—into flour and shoes and clothing, books and pictures and pianos, into good roads and good houses, into education, religion and philanthropy,—and legitimate trade shall have everywhere expanded; when every home shall be happier and every community a better place to live in; when a generation shall have

grown up that has never known the habit for liquor, nor the sight of a drunkard; when the storm of prejudice, of self-interest, and of appetite shall have subsided,—then the victory will be complete; then a reform more strongly contested, and more fraught with blessings for mankind than any other ever known, perhaps, will have been accomplished. Thenceforth men will be as likely to propose a return to the saloon system, as they are likely to-day to propose a return to the days of chattel slavery.

(III.)

CHAPTER XII.

THE PROHIBITION PARTY MOVEMENT.

TO THIS political movement, built upon lines of a distinctive temperance constituency, and addressing itself specifically to this one question,—an organized movement, which, while in all its history it has never carried a State or National election, has resisted disintegration and survived defeat—we shall devote our final chapter.

But before entering upon a discussion of this movement, with a view to making it more intelligible, we must pause and understand clearly the philosophy and method of popular government, and the nature and function of a political party. A party, in the proper sense, is not a permanent, self-existing, self-perpetuating political body, co-extensive with the government, with a beginning only, but no end. It exists not for itself, but for the people, whose creature it is and whose interests it must serve. Its tenure of life is conditioned by

the work it has been called into being to perform. Thus, the people and their interests are everything; the party nothing. The people rule; the party is the servant. The people are free—not bound by sect, creed, or party, bound only by the law of right. Statute laws they make or unmake, as the interests of the entire people may demand. Parties are formed or dissolved, according as the occasion for them may arise or cease. When in the exigency of time an important new issue is thrust forward, for instance, the citizens, after full and free discussion, unhampered, will arrange themselves about it according to their several convictions, and through the electorate the majority conviction is carried into effect of law. This concerted action to carry out a specific governmental policy; this standing together, if the policy awakens opposition, until it shall have been thoroughly established or tried—this is what properly constitutes a party and party action. The principle or issue comes logically first, therefore; the party afterward. The issue should form the party, not the party the issue. As long as the issue remains at stake, its supporters must remain together as a

party, disposing of such other matters of lesser importance as may in the meantime come within the province of governmental action. When the main issue is established, the work of the party is done, and it should be dissolved. That is to say, when the soul, which has lived and wrought, has gone, the body is dead, and must be allowed to return to its constituent elements, to enter new forms. This is nature's method of renewal. In like manner the elements of a nation's citizenship, when a given work has been done, should be again free and assimilable to vital new political principles, to enter new formations for new work. Thus will a nation's life be kept both pure and progressive.

Or as the issues on a field of battle will depend largely upon the mobility of the army, the commander forming and re-forming, and disposing his men as the situation and the changing movements of the enemy shall require, so in that succession of battles of a nation's peace army, in which, with the weapons of a freeman's ballot, injustice, greed, and oppression are to be vanquished, the measure of success will depend largely upon the mobility of the citizen soldiery, in being able

to form and re-form with freedom and celerity, moving in attack now here, now there, as the enemy in various places and forms shall threaten. The general who leads this citizen host in ever new battle formation is known as the statesman. He is not a "politician;" he is not a "party man," but a man of the people, serving them, and God. He does not push himself forward, seeking honors and office, but in the nation's exigency he is drawn forth. And when his service to his country is done, like Cincinnatus of old, he returns to his plow.

Herein lies the glory of free republican institutions. The political initiative lies with the free people, and it is they as a whole, not a part or a party, that forms the political unit and the basis of civic loyalty. It was for such a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, that our forefathers fought and the brave men in the days of Lincoln died. Washington stood for it. History says of his election, that it was "by the whole people." He bitterly lamented, with a vision that was prophetic, the slow but sure formation in his day of two distinct, integral, mutually

hostile, permanent political bodies, the beginnings of the dual party system, that Scylla and Charybdis of popular government, between which many a precious interest of the people is lost.

The national political formation known as the Prohibition party embodies the correct fundamental conception of popular government. The principle came first. After decades of agitation and labor the issue was thrust forward, during the fifties, as the culmination of a great reformation. From the several States dealing with the question individually it was about to assume a national scope, when the menacing activity of the slave power suddenly threw into the foreground another issue, which quickly drew to itself the suffrages of the people, formed a new political party, and wiped out the infamy of slavery forever. The Republican party had a proper birth. It was a great principle that brought it into being. The party wrought nobly and well—better than it knew. Beginning with opposing the further extension of slavery simply, it ended with its entire destruction. With the war and the days of reconstruction over, its work was properly done.

When the raging storm of Civil War was over, and the débris had been removed, and the dead buried, the temperance question, which but yesterday had been uppermost in men's minds, and first on the program of reform, pressed forward again. It claimed precedence by right both of its own importance and of its maturity for action. Concerted action was in fact becoming urgent, for during the war the liquor interests had organized and entered politics, and had recently uttered ugly threats against the widespread temperance activity. It was no time to sit idly by and see the fruits of a great reform slip away.

It was in such an exigency that the Prohibition party movement took shape. A new work was at hand, a new principle seeking political embodiment. For has not every soul or life principle its own body, adapted to and representative of itself? Because a group of persons think alike, and have acted together, upon one thing, it does not follow that they will also think alike and act together upon a different thing. Every signal reform requires a re-forming of political constituencies. Unless this is done, will not the work be

greatly hampered and delayed, or made impossible?

The political history of our land during the last thirty years, since the inception of this movement, shows, however, the anomalous fact that at no time during this period has the temperance contingent in our citizenship been sufficiently free to become assimilable to this one great central principle—this in face of the most widespread, continued, and solemn protestations of its primal urgency.

The causes for this are not wholly obscure. When the great general said, "The war is over, let us have peace," the bitter passions engendered in the conflict were by no means at once extinguished. The vacant chair in homes all over the land was too severe a reminder of the awful fratricidal strife. And the politician, too—God have mercy on his soul—instead of seeking to cement the bonds of a broken national unity, had to make political capital out of the circumstance that there had been a rebellion. The sectionalism and party animosity thus accentuated and kept awakened did not prepare men's minds for free united

action on the question of temperance. It did serve, as a matter of fact, to fasten upon us that very spirit of party passion over which, like a stone of stumbling, the temperance cause has been grievously hurt.

Later, when the wounds of battle were healing over; when this "waving the bloody shirt" by the demagogue was becoming less effectual and, failing to serve its purpose, ceased; when men remembered that there had been a temperance question, they said (not finding it on their party program), "But the people are not ready for this question." To which it was replied, "Help us get them ready. How do you know they are not ready? Are *you* ready? and *you*? and *you*? Let us stand together then and see how strong we really are." Then, a little later, as if recognizing the necessity for a mass movement on this question, temperance men who wanted to retain their membership in an historical party and still in some way settle the drink question, said again, "It is a mistake to make this question a football of party politics; it can only be accomplished by non-partisan effort." So the "National League for the Suppression of the Liquor Traffic—Non-

Partisan and Non-Sectarian," was called into being—"thrust forth by Providence," to use the language of its chief founder. This, as we have seen, lived but a short time. To try to dislodge an enemy without making it a party matter, when the enemy is entrenched not so much behind the law simply, as behind the dual party system of making and administering the law—this was found to be inadequate and impracticable. But interest in the cause was waxing, and men could not be contented to leave it here. So still trying to settle this question without disarranging party lines—party ties since the war having become strong—it was said again, "The strength of the temperance sentiment is in the Republican party; that party shall take up the question." Whereupon came the Anti-Saloon Republican movement, which we have also noted. This distinctively and avowedly partisan movement started out as sanguinely as did the preceding non-partisan movement. But the Republican party, as we have seen, hesitated, and then refused, to father the child, and after a last effort for its recognition, in the campaign of 1888, it died also.

But the cause was not to rest even here. Men loved their party, it was true; but they loved the cause of temperance also. The next, and most recent, movement was to embody some concessions on both sides. The temperance question was not to press itself peremptorily upon any party, for recognition as a party issue, on the one hand; nor, on the other hand, were party ties to be so strong as to bind a man irrevocably to his party's candidate in every local election. That is, the movement was not to concern itself so much with national platforms and policies, as it was to turn the scales in local contests, by throwing its influence to the candidate, among the two or more who stand a chance of being elected, who is most favorably disposed toward the temperance cause. This is the National Anti-Saloon League, a movement that began with the formation of the Ohio State Anti-Saloon League, at Oberlin, in 1893. On its political side the League fights the battles of temperance with the same weapons which the liquor power has so successfully used these many years; namely, the business-above-party, balance-of-power method. In this, however, the League lacks cer-

tain advantages possessed by the liquor power, with this further difference: the League exercises discrimination only in local or legislative contests, generally, still supporting in a national canvass parties that are committed to the policy of license and perpetuation, whereas if any party in its national platform should pronounce for the prohibition of the liquor traffic, the liquor power would throw its undivided influence against that party and defeat it.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Anti-Saloon League is not itself a political temperance organism, therefore, party Prohibitionists have generally given it their sympathy, and not a few their active co-operation, on account of its work in the fields of agitation, and education, and law enforcement. As for the portion of temperance sentiment in the land that has not been brought under the direction of the League, nor into the ranks of the Prohibition party, it has during these years confined itself to resolutions and editorials and public denunciations of the drink business, supplementing it generally by voting no-license in local elections, when the question is up, where party

prejudices are not awakened nor party ties disturbed. The political leaders, who in the interests of self-preservation and party success have never ceased to declare that this is not a political issue, have successfully diverted the public mind, on the day of national election, to questions of commerce and finance.

In this way it has come about that the great temperance principle has never yet received a sufficiently complete political embodiment to give it final and lasting success. Beginning with the year 1872, when James Black received 5,607 votes, mostly from Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Michigan, the Prohibition party vote in successive national campaigns has been as follows: In 1876, for Green Clay Smith, 9,737; in 1880, for Neal Dow, 10,366; in 1884, for St. John, 150,626; in 1888, for Clinton B. Fisk, 249,907; in 1892, for John Bidwell, 279,191. Up to this time the gain, if somewhat slow, was steady. However, at the national convention in 1896, in Pittsburg, a division occurred over the question whether the party should adopt a "broad gauge" or a "narrow gauge" platform; that is, whether the party should take

a position upon general questions of finance that were engaging the attention of the country at that time, or whether the party should confine itself to the one great issue to which it was born. When the majority sentiment expressed itself for the latter course, a number of delegates left the convention hall and nominated a separate ticket, with Mr. Charles E. Bentley, of Nebraska, at its head. They called themselves the National party. Receiving only a small vote the party ceased to exist as a party after the campaign. This circumstance, together with the widespread, intense interest created during the campaign on the question of sound money, deflecting public interest from an issue so largely moral as the drink question, caused the vote of the Prohibition party nominee, Mr. Joshua Levering, for that year to fall to 132,009. A good percentage of gain was made again in the election of 1900, when Mr. John G. Woolley, after an aggressive and spirited canvass, polled 209,936 votes.

The fact that this movement has not been more largely supported; that it has ever remained so far from carrying a national election, this is

a matter for the most earnest consideration by both those within, and those outside of the party movement. For let it be borne in mind, on the one hand, that this movement rests upon sound political philosophy, namely, that every signal new issue must gather to itself afresh an organized political constituency, or "party," to carry it into effect,—a position not true in the abstract simply, but one which the temperance history—the reversions and "failures of prohibition"—since the Civil War has demonstrated with a cogency that can not be honestly evaded. On the other hand, it must not escape candid reflection that in practical politics reason and philosophy do not always find free course—have not so found in the instance of this reform; that while it may be true that had the temperance sentiment of the country united in this movement and made the temperance question the dominant issue in American politics, this question would probably have been irrevocably settled, the fact is that temperance sentiment has not become thus united, the temperance question has not been made the dominant issue in American politics, and the contest is not settled.

So let us ask ourselves with all candor this question: Whatever may be one's convictions as to the right and logical necessity of the Prohibition party movement, what prospect has that party to-day of actually getting into power? For in matters of statecraft the ultimate criterion of conduct must take into account not alone, Is it right and logical? but also, What am I likely by such a course to achieve? And since this movement has up to the present time come so far short of its goal, what, if anything, is there in the present political situation that would justify the citizen in allying himself with this party, when other issues of more or less importance, by other parties, are before the people, upon which there is a prospect of winning? Of all the obstacles that have been met with in the temperance reformation, none probably has been more stubborn and perplexing than this.

What shall we say, then? It is here that the logic of events, after rough handling, has brought us. It was here that Gough came, after he had wrought in the cause for forty years, the most famed of the world's temperance apostles. The

young man, John B. Finch, consecrated his matchless talents to this movement. Haddock fell here, a martyr. Generals Neal Dow and Clinton Fisk, intrepid warriors in every peace battle of God, led the fight here. Miss Frances Willard, with rich gifts consecrated to humanity, from deaf ears turned here for hope. These all died in the faith. Shall it be said that what men, after weary search, believed to be the way of hope—a way first pointed out by the supreme body of the world's largest and most active temperance order—is now only the place of confusion and despair?

One can only say this: do not lightly give up logic; by that sign man shall conquer. Logic is not an abstract thing from the hazy realm of metaphysics; it is the form of omnipotence! Everywhere in society we find traces of its work. It is sometimes slow getting under way; but once it gets its momentum men will fly for their life! The pent-up indignation everywhere against the liquor business and against the infamy of its official sanction, this is the sure ground of promise. Out of these elements the cause will gather to itself momentum, some day—before very long. We

must allow something yet for conscience and intelligence. It may, or may not, be that men have not voted in accordance with their prayers, but it is their prayers, nevertheless, that speak their souls' genuine desire; and if they shall continue to receive not they will learn some day that it is because they have been asking amiss. Prejudice, self-interest, party love—these may be strong, but they are not stronger than love of truth and honor and right. They of the Church who send missionaries to the ends of the earth that they may teach idolatrous and fetich-worshiping peoples of the one true God who is spirit and truth, will not bow forever to the fetich of a party name in their own midst.

But there is this to be said further, and finally: the inference that a citizen's support of a party or party movement is justified only in the event of a probability of immediate majorities at the polls, can hardly be established as a valid general principle, and in this instance is not pertinent. There are two distinct stages before us before the goal of the temperance reform is reached. To elect a ticket is the second step only, the last thing

to be done. The first step—the longer and harder of the two—is to win recognition for this question as an issue in general politics; to get it squarely before the people for an honest vote; to deliver the question from the eternal torment of local politics and make it national. That sermons, prayers, resolutions, petitions, appeals will not accomplish this has been thoroughly demonstrated. Only votes cast for this specific issue in sufficient numbers will accomplish it. This does not require majorities. A respectable, united minority will do it. To accomplish this is the immediate program of the Prohibition party movement.

Thus in the coming election, while it will require something like six or seven million or more votes to elect a national ticket, to win recognition for the drink issue would require probably not more than a half million votes. Such a vote cast for this specific issue would give it sufficient prominence—would thrust it so plainly in sight in the political arena—that it would become impossible longer to ignore it. That the Prohibition party, which has never been more completely organized than now, nor pushed its work more aggressively,

will yet succeed in this,—this does not seem to lie beyond the measure of belief.

What will happen when this point has been reached no man may foresee. This much only is reasonably certain, that when the American people once grapple this question in close embrace, the saloon will be done for; it will be settled for good. The Prohibition party may gather into itself the temperance elements of the nation, become itself the dominant party and carry the issue to a successful close. This would from now on become comparatively easy and rapid; for there is law of gravitation for political bodies as there is for bodies terrestrial; namely, that attraction increases with the mass and with the nearness with which the object sought is at hand. With the opposition vote distributed among several parties such success might become possible without an actual majority vote. The Republican party came into power in 1860, when it had polled only two-fifths of the total popular vote.

Or there may be a new alignment of political parties, one of the larger parties perhaps taking up the question, for the sake of its own life, or

when it shall offer success at the polls. Or, again, an entirely new party may emerge when the contest shall become general.

The Prohibition party movement, then, must find its justification in the necessity of the immediate political situation; in the conviction that enough men can be brought together to accomplish this essential first work,—men whom the *Lo here!* and the *Lo there!* of the professional party juggler at each quadrennial political pageant shall cease to allure and turn aside, absolutely unmoved by the prediction that the nation will perish if the other party is allowed to win; men who believe that the powers that be, ordained as they are of God, should facilitate and further the work of God—that they should rise in the electorate above personalities and the sounding of party plaudits, above rates and schedules, to *men*, to the real interests of a people, the sobriety, health, and virtue of its citizenship, the purity and peace of its homes, the sacred maintenance of a sound civic conscience,—it is the conviction, we repeat, that out of America's enfranchised citizenship a half million and more such men will yet stand together

upon a platform that calls for the national suppression of the trade in strong drink—which reaches all these interests more widely than any measure that governments have thus far yet employed or proposed,—that must constitute the hope and the justification for the organized prohibition movement, which shall clear a way out of this wilderness and ambush warfare into the open, where the struggle will be fought to a finish.

INDEX.



Page	Page
Abstinence, early embodied in reform 52	Blue Ribbon Movement....232
Correct personal principle279	Brewers' Association, The U. S.179, 162, 249, 250
Alcohol, first effects of...298	Cadets of Temperance..... 93
American Temperance Society formed 52	Cass, General Lewis, promoter of temperance.72, 73
Report of progress..... 71	Catholic Total Abstinence Union227
Merged in American Temperance Union ... 83	Chapin, Rev. Calvin, early advocate 56
American Temperance Union 83	Cheever, Rev. Geo. B., "Deacon Giles' Distillery" 69
Superseded by National Temperance Society and Publication-house.225	Church (Episcopal) Temperance Society229
American Tract Society.48, 60	College Presidents in early reform 63
Anti-canteen law243	Committee of Fifty.....293
Anti-saloon League, National276, 394	Congregational Churches take up question..... 42
Anti-saloon Republican Movement271	Congressional Temperance Society73, 96
Appleton, Gen. James, on license laws122	Constitutional prohibition. State263
Army, spirit ration abolished 72	National, labored for...266
Atwater, Prof. W. O., experiments with alcohol.292	Convention, National Temperance, first 74
	Second76, 83
	World's first 97
	Second126
Beecher, Rev. Lyman, pioneer in reform..... 35	Crusade, The Woman's...234
His report on temperance at General Association of Connecticut 42	
His six sermons..... 49	"Deacon Amos Giles' Distillery" 69
Benezet, Anthony, forerunner of reform..... 33	Delavan, Edward C....85, 97
Bible wines controversy... 86	Democratic Party, attitude on temperance ...271, 336
Black, James ...224, 253, 396	Dispensary System258
Blair, Henry W..268, 274, 294	Dorchester, Rev. Daniel...270

	Page		Page
Dow, Neal, brings in era of prohibition	107, 116, 126, 396	Internal Revenue, Bureau of, created.....	139
Drink. See Liquor.		International Anti-alcoholic Congress	291
Edwards, Rev. Justin, master organizer of early reform ..48, 67, 73, 82, 83		Interstate commerce, as affecting prohibition.....	319
Episcopal Church Temperance Society	229	Iowa, case of prohibition in	345, 354
Europe, temperance reform introduced from America	65, 85	Jewett, Dr. Charles, temperance lecturer ..98, 226	
Fifty, Committee of.....	293	Judicial Decisions. See Supreme Court.	
Finch, John B....	95, 235, 400	Kittredge, Jonathan, address on temperance. 58	
Fisk, Gen. Clinton B.....	272, 396	Law and Order Leagues, organized	254
Fisk, Rev. Wilbur, early temperance leader in Methodism	62	Lewis, Dr. Dio, relation to woman's crusade.....	235
Foster, Mrs. J. Ellen.....	245, 270	Lincoln, Abraham, work in temperance	90
Garrison, Wm. Lloyd, early temperance editor.....	57	Liquor, amount annually expended for	211
Germany, effects of beer drinking in	230	Capital invested in production of	157
Leaders in temperance.....	298	Consumption of	157, 159
Good Templars, Independent Order of.....	94	Organization of—interests	179, 182
Gothenturg System	259	Taxation of, by Federal Government.....	140, 165
Gough, John B....	100, 272, 399	Under expansion	179
Griffin, Albert, leader Anti-saloon Republican Movement	273	Litchfield, agreement among farmers in county	34
Haddock, Rev. Geo. C., murdered	184	Local option, early in operation	119
Hastings, Samuel D.....	95	Handicap of	317
Hawkins, John H. W., leader of Washingtonianism	89	Ethics of	323
Hepburn-Dolliver Bill, interstate commerce in liquor	320	Loyal Temperance Legion.....	242
Hewit, Rev. Nathaniel, Luther of early reform	56, 81	Marsh, Rev. John, "Putnam and the Wolf".....	61, 76
High License policy inaugurated	256	Secretary American Temperance Union	84, 131
Hitchcock, Prof. Edward..	61	Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance	45
Humphrey, Rev. Heman, powerful early advocate	38, 63, 68	Mathew, Father Theobald, Irish apostle of temperance in America....	101
Hunt, Rev. Thomas P., temperance lecturer...	98	Methodist Church first takes up question.....	40

Page	Page
Moreau, N. Y., Temperance Society 37	Prohibition—
Murphy, Francis, Blue Ribbon Movement 232	(Constitutional) Kansas,
Mussey, Prof. R. D., address on temperance... 60	Iowa, Maine, Rhode Island, North Dakota, South Dakota 265
National Anti-saloon League 276	Party, organized 253, 269, 271, 385ff
National League for the Suppression of Liquor Traffic 269	Repeals of, Delaware, Nebraska, Indiana, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut. Michigan 248
National Philanthropist, first temperance newspaper 57	South Dakota 262
National Temperance Convention, first 44	Vermont, New Hampshire 306, 355
Second 76, 83	Rehabites, Independent Order of 92
National Temperance Society and Publication-house 225	Red Ribbon Movement... 232
Navy, grog banished from. 91	Reform Clubs, The..... 230
Nott, Eliphalet, powerful early advocate 63	Republican party, attitude on temperance 271, 275, 336, 338
Orders, Fraternal Temperance 92f, 226	Reynolds, Dr. Henry A., Reform Clubs 231
"Original Package" Decision 319	Royal Templars of Temperance 226
Pearson, Rev. Samuel F., Sheriff of Portland... 363	Rush, Dr. Benjamin, originator of temperance reformation 22
Pepper, Dr. William, on alcohol 294	His "Inquiry" 25-31
Porter, Rev. Ebenezer, sermon on intemperance.. 37	At Presbyterian General Assembly 39
Presbyterian Church appoints committee on temperance 39	Sargent, Lucius, Temperance Tales 68
Prohibition, logical culmination of reform... 107, 122	Science and alcohol..... 292
Correct public policy... 299	Scientific temperance instruction in schools... 243
Enacted: Maine... 111, 124	Sewall, Dr., charts of human stomach 97
Minnesota, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Vermont 125	Slavery Reform, its relation to temperance reform. 132
Michigan 126	Smith, Gerrit, 118, 253
Connecticut 127	Sons of Temperance..... 93
New York 128	Stearns, J. N., secretary National Temperance Society 225
New Hampshire 129	St. John, John P.... 272, 396
Delaware, Nebraska, Indiana 130	Stuart, Prof. Moses, Prize Essay 61
	Sunday-schools introduce temperance lessons... 243

	Page		Page
Supreme Court, U. S., de-		Thompson, Mrs. Eliza J.,	
cisions bearing on		leader of Woman's	
drink question.....		Crusade	235
	119, 183, 319		
Temperance Societies, first		Washingtonian movement..	87
crude efforts	36	Willard, Miss Frances.....	
Taxation. See Liquor.			239, 246, 269, 400
Teetotalism introduced		Wilson, Henry W., opposes	
into reform	76	Federal tax on liquor..	141
In Europe	81	Woman's Christian Tem-	
Temperance Tales, Sargent.	68	perance Union....	238, 247
Templars of Honor and		Woman's Crusade, The....	234
Temperance	94		

378

[illegible]

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

F296

38226

Fehlandt, A.F.

TITLE Century of drink reform
in the U.S.

[illegible]

